DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 614 EC 305 791

AUTHOR	Prouty, Robert, Ed.; Lakin, K. Charlie, Ed.
TITLE	Residential Services for Persons with Developmental Disabilities: Status and Trends through 1995. Report #49.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Research and Training Center on Community Living.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration on Developmental Disabilities (DHHS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1996-05-00
NOTE	272p.
CONTRACT	90DD0302/02
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, Institute on Community Integration, 109 Pattee Hall, 150 Pillsbury Drive S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455; telephone: 612-624-4512 ($12).
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Foster Care; Adults; Children; Community Programs; *Deinstitutionalization (of Disabled); *Developmental Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Group Homes; Institutionalized Persons; *Mental Retardation; Residential Care; Residential Institutions; *Residential Programs; *Residential Schools; State Programs; *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	Intermediate Care Facilities; *Medicaid

ABSTRACT

This report from the ongoing National Residential Information Systems Project on Residential Services provides statistics on persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD) receiving residential services in the U.S. for the year ending June 30,1995, as well as comparative statistics from earlier years. The report includes a description of how the information was collected and an executive summary. The executive summary highlights key findings in the areas of: (1) state-operated residential services, including the number and size of residential facilities, the number of residents, expenditures, and facility closures; (2) all state and non-state residential services, including number and size of residential settings, number of residents, interstate variability, state and non-state residential setting by type, and patterns of change in residential service systems from 1977 to 1995; and (3) Medicaid funded services, including intermediate care facilities for persons with mental retardation, Medicaid Home and Community Based Services, nursing home residents, and Medicaid Community Supported Living Arrangements. Findings indicate the number of state-operated facilities continues to grow, the number of residential settings (including care and instruction) for persons with MR/DD is also growing, and the number of intermediate care facilities has decreased. (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 614

Residential Services for Persons with Developmental Disabilities: Status and Trends Through 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Report # 49
May 1997

Research and Training Center on Community Living
Institute on Community Integration/UAP

The College of Education & Human Development
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

EC 305 791

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Residential Services for Persons with Developmental Disabilities: Status and Trends Through 1996

Report # 49

Contributions by: Lynda Anderson, Ellen Blake, Robert Bruininks, Charlie Lakin, Barbara Polister, Robert Prouty, and Jennifer Sandlin

Edited by: Robert Prouty and K. Charlie Lakin

Research and Training Center on Community Living
Institute on Community Integration/UAP
College of Education and Human Development
University of Minnesota
214 Pattee Hall, 150 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455

May 1997

Preparation of this report was supported by a grant from the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (Grant No. 90DN0028/01) with supplemental support from the Health Care Financing Administration of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Research and Training Center on Community Living receives core support from the National Institute on Disabilities and Rehabilitation Research, U.S. Department of Education (Agreement No. H133B30072). The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect an official position of any sponsoring agency.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is based on statistics gathered and analyzed as part of the National Residential Information Systems Project on Residential Services (RISP). The authors wish to thank the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD), its Commissioner Bob Williams, and our Project Officer, Ron Filewich, for ongoing support of this project and its various activities. We also appreciate the supplemental support received from the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) and from Sam Brown and Nancy Miller of HCFA's Office of Research and Demonstrations. This and other projects of the Research and Training Center on Community Living are greatly assisted by the core support of the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, its Director, Kate Seelman, and our Project Officer, Roseann Rafferty.

Many people other than the chapter authors played important roles in acquiring, analyzing, and describing the data summarized in this report. Our special thanks to Gary Smith for his invaluable editorial assistance. Brian Burwell of the MEDSTAT Group provided ICF-MR expenditure data summarized in Chapter 8.

As always, we are totally indebted to the more than 300 state and individual facility respondents who provided the statistics used in this report. Clearly this report would not be possible without their knowledge, expertise and generous assistance.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained postage-paid for $12.00 per copy from the Publications Office, Institute on Community Integration, 109 Pattee Hall, 150 Pillsbury Drive SE, Minneapolis, MN 55455, (612) 624-4512. Please make checks payable to the University of Minnesota.

The recommended citation for statistics in this report is: [Chapter authors] (1997). [Chapter title]. In R.W. Prouty & K.C. Lakin (Eds.), *Residential services for persons with developmental disabilities: Status and trends through 1996*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Research and Training Center on Community Living, Institute on Community Integration.

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

LIST OF TABLES iv

LIST OF FIGURES vi

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY viii

INTRODUCTION xix

SECTION I

STATUS AND CHANGES IN
STATE-OPERATED RESIDENTIAL SERVICES 1

CHAPTER 1

POPULATIONS OF STATE-OPERATED RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS IN 1996 3
Number of State-Operated Residential Facilities 3
Residents of State-Operated Facilities 6
Populations per 100,000 of the General Population 6
Change in Average Daily Population; 1980-1996 8
Movement of Residents in Large State
MR/DD Facilities 8
Admissions 8
Deaths 8
Per Person Expenditures in State-Operated
Residential Facilities 11

CHAPTER 2

LONGITUDINAL TRENDS IN LARGE STATE-OPERATED
RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES, 1950-1996 13
Average Daily Population of Persons with
Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities 13
Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental
Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities per 100,000 of the
General Population 15
Movement Patterns in Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities 16
Annual Per Resident Expenditures in
Large State-Operated MR/DD Facilities 17

CHAPTER 3

LARGE STATE MR/DD RESIDENTIAL FACILITY CLOSURES, 1960-2000 AND
INDIVIDUAL FACILITY POPULATIONS AND PER DIEM RATES IN FISCAL
YEAR 1996 19
Total Large State MR/DD Facility Closures 19
Closures and Projected Closures by States 19
Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities
Operating and Closing, 1960-2000 20
Individual Large State Facility populations and Per Diem Rates 20

CHAPTER 4
CHARACTERISTICS AND MOVEMENT OF RESIDENTS OF LARGE STATE FACILITIES 34
Characteristics of Residents 34
Age of Residents 34
Level of Mental Retardation 36
Functional Characteristics 37
Age by Level of Mental Retardation 37
State-by-State Resident Characteristics 38
Gender of Residents 38
Age Distribution of Residents 38
Level of Mental Retardation 41
Selected Additional Conditions 41
Selected Functional Assistance Needs of Residents 43
Residents in Movement 46
New Admissions by Age and Level of Mental Retardation 46
Readmissions by Age and Level of Mental Retardation 47
Discharges by Age and Level of Mental Retardation 47
Persons in Movement in 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996 48
Previous Placement of New Admissions 49
Previous Placement of Readmissions 50
New Residence of Discharged Residents 51

SECTION II

STATUS AND CHANGES IN TOTAL STATE RESIDENTIAL SERVICE SYSTEMS 53
CHAPTER 5
SERVICES PROVIDED BY STATE AND NONSTATE AGENCIES IN 1996 55
Number of Residential Settings 55
Number of Persons Receiving Residential Services 55
Relative Size of Residential Settings 58
Average residential settings size 58
Percentage living in small residential settings 58
Number of Residential Service Recipients Per 100,000 General Population 61
Persons Presently Not Receiving Residential Services on Waiting Lists for Residential Services 63
CHAPTER 6
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS AND RESIDENTS BY TYPE OF LIVING ARRANGEMENT 64
"Congregate Care" Settings and Residents 64
"Family Foster Care" Settings and Residents 64
"Own Home" Settings and Residents 67
"Family Home" Settings and Residents 67
CHAPTER 7
CHANGING PATTERNS IN RESIDENTIAL SERVICE SYSTEMS: 1977-1996 69
Changing Patterns in Residential Settings 69

Changes in Number of Residential Service Recipients 69
Residential Settings, by Size, of Persons with MR/DD in 1982 and 1996 72

SECTION III

STATUS AND CHANGES IN MEDICAID FUNDED RESIDENTIAL AND RELATED SERVICES 73
CHAPTER 8
BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF MEDICAID LONG-TERM CARE PROGRAMS 75
Federal Involvement Prior to ICFs-MR 75
Establishment of the ICF-MR Program 75
Small Community ICF-MR Group Homes 76
Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) 77
Community Supported Living Arrangements(CSLA) 77
Medicaid Nursing Facilities 77
CHAPTER 9
UTILIZATION OF AND EXPENDITURES FOR MEDICAID INSTITUTIONAL AND HOME AND COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES 79
ICF-MR Program Utilization on June 30, 1996 79
Number of facilities 79
Number of residents 81
Nonstate ICF-MR Utilization 81
Large nonstate ICFs-MR 81
Nonstate community ICFs-MR 83
State ICF-MR Utilization 83
Large state ICFs-MR 83
State-operated community ICFs-MR 84
Large and Small ICFs-MR 85
Expenditures for ICF-MR Services 89
Interstate Variations in ICF-MR Expenditures 93
Per capita cost variations 93
Variations due to disproportionate placements 93
Variations due to differences in per recipient expenditures 93
Medicaid HCBS Recipients 93
Expenditures for HCBS Recipients 94
Per capita cost variations 94
Variations due to disproportionate placements 94
Variations due to differences in per recipient expenditures 94
HCBS Recipients and Residents of Community ICFs-MR 98
ICF-MR and HCBS Recipients and Expenditures 101
Variations in State Financial Benefit for Combined ICF-MR and HCBS Programs 104
Indexed Utilization Rates 105
Residential Arrangements of HCBS Recipients 110

Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in Generic Medicaid Nursing Facilities 110
ICF-MR and HCBS for Persons with MR/DD as a Proportion of All Federal Medicaid Expenditures 113
CHAPTER 10
CONVERSION OF MEDICAID INTERMEDIATE CARE FACILITIES FOR PERSONS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION/DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES TO HOME AND COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES 115
HCBS Recipients per Home 115
Selection of HCBS Recipients 119
Conversions of ICF-MR to HCBS 122
Number of conversions 122
Reasons for Conversions 122
Post-Conversion Changes 125
Discussion 128

SECTION IV

STATE PROFILES OF SELECTED SERVICE INDICATORS, 1977-1996 129
CHAPTER 11
PROFILES OF TRENDS IN STATE RESIDENTIAL SERVICES 131

REFERENCES AND DATA SOURCES 185

APPENDIX A: KEY STATE CONTACTS 189

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Number of State-Operated Residential Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State 4
Table 1.2 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in State-Operated MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State 5
Table 1.3 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in State-Operated MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities Per 100,000 of the General Population on June 30, 1996 7
Table 1.4 Average Daily Population of Persons with MR/DD Living in Large State MR/DD Facilities by State, 1980-1996, and Percentage Changes 9
Table 1.5 Movement of Persons with MR/DD In and Out of Large State MR/DD Facilities to Fiscal Year 1996 by State 10
Table 1.6 Average per Resident Daily Expenditures in State-Operated Facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 by State 12
Table 1.7 Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities, 1950-1996 14
Table 1.8 Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities per 100,000 of the General Population, 1950-1996 15
Table 1.9 Movement Patterns in Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996 16
Table 1.10 Average Annual Per Resident Expenditures for Care in Large State-Operated MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996 18

Table 1.11 Summary of Large State MR/DD Facilities and Units Since 1960, including Closures and Planned Closures Between 1960 and 2000 20
Table 1.12 Large State MR/DD Facility Closures, 1960-2000 and Individual Facility Populations and Per Diem Expenditures in Fiscal Year 1996 21
Table 1.13 Characteristics of Residents of Large State Facilities on June 30: 1977, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996 35
Table 1.14 Distribution of Residents of Large State Facilities by Level of Mental Retardation and Age on June 30, 1996 37
Table 1.15 Gender Distribution of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996 39
Table 1.16 Age of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996 40
Table 1.17 Level of Mental Retardation of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996 42
Table 1.18 Selected Additional Conditions of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996 44
Table 1.19 Selected Functional Needs of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996 45
Table 1.20 New Admissions to Large State Facilities by Age and Level of Mental Retardation in the Year Ending June 30, 1996 46
Table 1.21 Readmissions to Large State Facilities by Age and Level of Mental Retardation in the Year Ending June 30, 1996 47
Table 1.22 Discharges to Large State Facilities by Age and Level of Mental Retardation in the Year Ending June 30, 1996 48
Table 1.23 Previous Placement of Persons Newly Admitted to Large State Facilities, Fiscal years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996 50
Table 1.24 Previous Placement of Persons Readmitted to Large State Facilities, Fiscal years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996 50
Table 1.25 New Place of Residence of Persons Discharged from Large State Facilities, Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996 51

Table 2.1 Residential Settings for Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Served by State and Nonstate Agencies on June 30, 1996 56
Table 2.2 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Served by State and Nonstate Agencies on June 30, 1996 57
Table 2.3 Summary Statistics on the Size of Residential Settings on June 30, 1996 60
Table 2.4 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Receiving Residential Services per 100,000 of State General Population by Size of Residential Setting, June 30, 1996 61
Table 2.5 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Who Were on Waiting List for, but Not Receiving Residential Services on June 30, 1996 63
Table 2.6 Number of "Congregate Care" Residential Settings and Residents including all ICFs-MR on June 30, 1996 by State 65
Table 2.7 Number of Family Foster Care Settings and Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in Them on June 30, 1996 by State 66
Table 2.8 Number of Homes Owned or Leased by Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Conditions and the Number of People Living in Them on June 30, 1996 by State 67
Table 2.9 Number of People with MR/DD Receiving Services While Living in the Home of a Family Member on June 30, 1996 by State 68
Table 2.10 State and Nonstate Residential Settings for Persons with MR/DD on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996 71
Table 2.11 Persons with MR/DD Receiving State and Nonstate Residential Services on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996 71

Table 3.1 ICF-MR Certified Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State 80

S

Table 3.2 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in ICF-MR Certified Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State and Size 82
Table 3.3 Number and Percentage of Residents in ICF-MR Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State and Size 86
Table 3.4 Summary Statistics on ICF-MR Expenditures by State for Fiscal Year 1996 91
Table 34a Summary Statistics on ICF-MR Expenditures Using Average Daily Resident by State for Fiscal Year 1996 92
Table 3.5 Summary Statistics on HCBS Recipients by State on June 30 of Years 1982 through 1996 95
Table 3.6 Summary Statistics on HCBS Expenditures by State for Fiscal Year 1996 Using Average Daily Recipients 96
Table 36a Summary Statistic on HCBS Expenditures by State for Fiscal Year 1996 Using Average Daily Recipients 97
Table 3.7 ICF-MR Residents and Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) Recipients with Mental Retardation and Related Conditions on June 30, 1996 by State 99
Table 3.8 ICF-MR Residents and HCBS Recipients and ICF-MR and HCBS Expenditures on June 30, 1996 by State 102
Table 3.9 Summary of Combined ICF-MR and HCBS Contributions and State Benefit Ratios by State and for Fiscal Year 1996 103
Table 3.10 Utilization Rates per 100,000 of State Population: ICF-MR Residents, HCBS Recipients with MR/DD, and All Residential Service Recipients on June 30, 1996 by State 106
Table 3.11 HCBS Recipients with MR/DD by Type of Residential Setting on June 30, 1996 111
Table 3.12 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in Nursing Facilities on June 30, 1995 by State 112
Table 3.13 Federal Medicaid Expenditures for ICF-MR and HCBS Programs for Persons with MR/DD as a Proportion of All Federal Medicaid Expenditures 113
Table 3.14 HCBS Resident Limit and Authority, License/certification 116
Table 3.15 Selection of Persons with MR/DD to Receive HCBS 119
Table 3.16 Number of Residential Setting Directly Converted from ICFs-MR to HCBS 123
Table 3.17 Motives for Converting of ICFs-MR to HCBS 125
Table 3.18 Post-conversion Changes in Facilities and Programs 126

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities in Large MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities, 1950-1996 14
Figure 1.2 Average Daily Population of Persons with MR/DD in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities per 100,000 of the General Population on June 30 of Years Indicated 15
Figure 1.3 Movement Patterns in Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996 17
Figure 1.4 Average Annual Per Resident Expenditures in Large State-Operated MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996 18
Figure 1.5 Average Annual Number of Large State MR/DD Facilities and Units Closed and Planned for Closure, 1960-2000 19
Figure 1.6 Total and Childhood (0-21 Years) Populations of Large State MR/DD Facilities, 1950-1996 35
Figure 1.7 Level of Mental Retardation of Residents of Large State Facilities on June 30 of Selected Years, 1964-1996 36
Figure 1.8 Distribution of Admissions and Discharges for Large State Facilities by Level of Mental Retardation in Fiscal Years 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996 49

Figure 2.1 Average Number of Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities per Residential Setting on June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1995 and 1996 58
Figure 2.2 Percentage of All Residential Service Recipients in Settings with 6 or Fewer on

June 30, 1996 59
Figure 2.3 Residential Service Recipients per 100,000 of State General Population in 1996 62
Figure 2.4 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in State and Nonstate Residential Settings on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996 71
Figure 2.5 People with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in Residential Settings of Different Sizes on June 30, 1982 and June 30, 1996 72

Figure 3.1 ICF-MR Residents as a Proportion of All Reported Residents of State and Nonstate Settings by Size on June 30, 1996 84
Figure 3.2 Residents of ICF-MR Certified Facilities by Size and State/Nonstate Operation on June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996 85
Figure 3.3 Percentage of ICF-MR Residential Service Recipients in Settings with 15 or Fewer Residents on June 30, 1996 87
Figure 3.4 Percentage of All Residential Service Recipients in ICF-MR Certified Facilities on June 30, 1996 88
Figure 3.5 Number of Residents in ICF-MR and Non ICF-MR Residential Settings with 1-15 and 16 or More Total Residents, 1977 to 1996 90
Figure 3.6 Community ICF-MR & HCBS Recipients as a Percentage of All ICF-MR & HCBS Recipients on June 30, 1996 100
Figure 3.7 Residents of Settings with 15 or Fewer and 16 or More Residents Among Medicaid ICF-MR and HCBS Recipients on June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996 101
Figure 3.8 Total ICF-MR Residents per 100,000 of State Population by State on June 30, 1996 107
Figure 3.9 Total Community ICF-MR and HCBS Recipients per 100,000 of State Population by State on June 30, 1996 108
Figure 3.10 ICF-MR and Non ICF-MR Residential Service Recipients per 100,000 of the U.S. Population, 1962 to 1996 109

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State-Operated Residential Services

Number and Size of Residential Facilities

The number of state-operated facilities continues to decline. On June 30, 1996 states were directly operating 1,911 residential facilities housing persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD), 17 fewer than in the previous year. Of these 1,847 were facilities or units primarily serving persons with MR/DD and 46 were facilities primarily serving persons with psychiatric disabilities. Over four-fifths (86.4%) of the state-operated MR/DD facilities had 15 or fewer residents, a proportion that grew somewhat from June 1995 (82.9%).

On June 30, 1996 every state except New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island and the District of Columbia, was operating at least one large state mental retardation/developmental disabilities facility. New Hampshire closed its only large (16 or more residents) state MR/DD facility in January 1991. In Fiscal Year 1994 Vermont, Rhode Island and the District of Columbia closed the last of their large state MR/DD facilities.

The number of state-operated community facilities continues to grow slowly and New York remains by far the largest operator of state-operated community residences. State-operated community facilities (15 or fewer residents) increased by 4.7% (71 facilities) to a total of 1,595 in Fiscal Year 1996. By the end of Fiscal Year 1996, New York had an estimated 935 state-operated community facilities or 58.6% of the national total.

Number of Residents

The population of large state MR/DD facilities continue to fall. The population of large state MR/DD facilities on June 30, 1996 was 58,320, a decrease of 6.0% from June 30, 1995, continuing a trend first evident in Fiscal Year 1968. Between 1980 and 1996 large state MR/DD facilities' average daily populations were decreased by 71,152 to 59,936 individuals (54.3%). More than half (29) of all states reduced their average daily populations of large state MR/DD facility populations by 50% or more during the period.

The population of state-operated community facilities increased in Fiscal Year 1996. During Fiscal Year 1996 persons residing in small state-operated facilities (15 or fewer residents) increased 6.8%, to an ending year total of 10,642 persons. The average number of residents per state-operated community facility rose slightly between 1995 and 1996 (from 6.5 to 6.7 residents). New York accounted for two-thirds (66.5%) of all residents of state-operated community facilities.

The population of persons with MR/DD in all large state residential facilities continues to decline. On June 30, 1996, the combined population of residents with MR/DD in large state MR/DD and psychiatric facilities was 59,589 a decrease of 6.0 % from 1995. The estimated population of persons with MR/DD in state psychiatric facilities dropped from a population of 31,884 in 1970 and 9,405 in 1980 to 1,269 in 1996.

Nationally, the population of large state MR/DD facilities per 100,000 of the general population continues to fall. In 1996 there were 22.4 persons in large state MR/DD facilities per 100,000 of the general U.S. population. This compares with 23.5 in June 1995 and 99.7 in June 1967. Placement rates in 8 states were at 150% or more of the national average, while in 12 states with large state MR/DD facilities they were less than half the national average.

A number of states made very substantial reductions in their large state MR/DD facility average daily populations between 1990 and 1996. The total number of persons with MR/DD living in large state MR/DD facilities decreased by 29.0% between June 1990 and June 1996. The largest proportion decreases in large state MR/DD facility populations were, of course, in Vermont, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and the District of Columbia which closed all their large state MR/DD facilities. In addition, 14 other states reduced their large state-operated MR/DD facility populations by more than 40% over the six-year period.

Admissions, Discharges, and Deaths

Admissions to large state MR/DD facilities increased slightly in 1996. In Fiscal Year 1996 an estimated total of 2,537 persons with MR/DD were admitted to large state MR/DD facilities, an increase of 8.5% over the previous year. This was equal to 4.2% of the average daily population of these facilities during the year. Four states reported no admissions to their large state MR/DD facilities (the same as was reported in 1995). Six states reported admissions exceeding 10% of their average daily population.

Discharge rates from large state MR/DD facilities increased slightly in 1996. In 1996 an estimated total of 4,652 persons with MR/DD were discharged from large state MR/DD facilities, equal to 7.8% of the year's average daily population (as compared with 8.4% in 1995). In 1996 sixteen states reported discharges that equaled 10% or more of the average daily population of their large MR/DD facilities. Nine states with large state MR/DD facilities had discharges less than 5% of their average daily population.

The death rate among residents of large state MR/DD facilities in 1996 (1.7%) remained in the same range evident throughout the past decade. In 1996 an estimated total of 996 persons with MR/DD died while residing in large state MR/DD facilities. The 1.7% death rate in 1996 is generally consistent with recent rates of 1.7% in 1995, 1.5% in 1994, 1.6% in 1993, and 1.4% in 1992 and 1.4% in 1990. The small increases in institutional death rates in recent years may be attributed to the aging and more severely impaired populations of large MR/DD facilities.

Expenditures

In 1996 expenditures for care in large state MR/DD facilities continued to increase and reached a national annual average of $92,345.46 per person. Between 1995 and 1996 the average annual expenditures for care in large state MR/DD facilities increased from $85,760 to $92,345.46 (or an average of $252.31 per day). Ten states exceeded an average of $350 per day; 28 states reported annual expenditures per resident exceeding the national average. The 7.7% expenditure increase between 1995 and 1996 was more than the 4.0% increase between 1994 and 1995. The average annual increase from 1977 until 1993 was 10.0%.

Facility Closure

The closure of large state MR/DD facilities continues. Between 1992 and 1996, 59 large state MR/DD facilities were closed, an average of 11.8 closures per year. This compares with an average of 1.25 per year between 1976 and 1979, 3.0 per year between 1980 and 1987, and 8.5 per year between 1988 and 1991. Ten states closed at least one large MR/DD facility in Fiscal Year 1996. States report that an additional 20 large state MR/DD facilities are already projected to be closed between 1997 and 2000.

Resident Characteristics

The number of children and youth in large state MR/DD facilities continues to decrease rapidly, substantially more rapidly than the state MR/DD facility populations as a whole. On June 30, 1996 only 2,937 state MR/DD facility residents (5.0% of the total) were 21 years or younger. This compares with 6,944 persons 21 years or younger living in state MR/DD facilities (8.7% of the total) on June 30, 1991, and 54,130 (35.8% of the total) on June 30, 1977, and 91,590 (48.9% of the total) on June 30, 1965. Children who were 14 years or younger made up only 1.2% of state MR/DD populations in 1996 as compared with 2.3% in 1991. At least 18 states had no state institution residents who were less than 15 years old.

Large state MR/DD facility populations are overwhelmingly made up of non-elderly adults and increasingly of middle-aged adults. On June 30, 1996 87.3% of large state MR/DD facility residents were between 22 and 62 years old. This compares with 60.5% in 1977, 73.1% in 1982, 81.4% in 1987 and 84.3% in 1991. More than two-fifths

(42.7%) of state MR/DD facility residents in 1996 were in the 40-62 year age range. This compares with 19.2% in 1977, 22.9% in 1982, 27.3% in 1987 and 32.5% in 1991. This reflects the maturing of the "baby boom" cohort into middle age.

The number of large MR/DD facility residents 63 years and older has declined by nearly 1,100 since 1977, even as the proportion of "aging" residents has increased. On June 30, 1977 there were 5,590 persons 63 years or older in large state MR/DD facilities; on June 30, 1996 there were an estimated 4,505. However, as populations of large state MR/DD facilities have been reduced by more than 60% over the same period, the proportion of persons 63 years and older has increased substantially (3.7% in 1977, 5.0% in 1982, 6.0% in 1987, 7.0% in 1991 and 7.7% in 1996.

The proportion of state MR/DD facility populations made up of persons with the most severe cognitive impairments continues to grow. On June 30, 1996, 65.9% of all residents of large state MR/DD facilities were reported to have profound mental retardation. This compares with 45.6% in 1977, 56.2% in 1982, 63.0% in 1987, and 64.8% in 1991. Persons with mild or moderate mental retardation made up 16.3% of state facility residents on June 30, 1996. This compares with 26.8% of state institution residents in 1977, 19.6% in 1982, and 17.0% in 1987 and 16.1% in 1991. On June 30, 1996 more than one-half of all state MR/DD facility residents (54.1%) were persons with profound mental retardation between the ages of 22 and 54 years.

Although the proportion of persons with profound mental retardation among large state MR/DD populations continues to grow, their actual numbers continue to decrease. Between June 30, 1977 and June 30, 1996 the estimated number of persons with profound mental retardation living in large state MR/DD facilities decreased by more than 30,000 (from 68,907 to 38,417). This compares with an increase of nearly 20,000 state facility residents with profound mental retardation in the period between 1964 and 1977.

The proportion of large state MR/DD residents with significant functional impairments continues to increase. On June 30, 1996, 35.7% of state facility residents were reported to be unable to walk without assistance. This compares with 23.3% in 1977, 25.5% in 1982, 29.5% in 1987 and 32.4% in 1991. However, the total number of state facility residents unable to walk without assistance decreased by about 14,400 between 1977 and 1996 (from 35,200 to 20,820). Similarly in 1996, 57.0% of state facility residents were reported to be unable to toilet themselves independently. This compares with 34.1% in 1977. But between 1977 and 1996 the total number of people living in large state facilities who were unable to toilet themselves independently actually decreased by over 18,000 persons.

Most large state MR/DD facility residents are 40 years or older. With the increasing proportions of residents in both middle aged (40-62 years) and aging (63 years or older) categories, on June 30, 1996 for the first time ever the majority (50.4%) of large state MR/DD facility residents were at least 40 years old. This compares with one-third (33.3%) of all residents only 9 years earlier.

Most large state facility residents have 2 or more sensory, neurological or behavioral conditions in addition to mental retardation. On June 30, 1996, 15.3% of large state MR/DD residents were reported to be functionally blind and 7.4% were reported to be functionally deaf. Seizure disorders were reported for 46.1% of residents and 22.6% were reported to have cerebral palsy. Nearly half (45.7%) of all residents were reported to have some form of behavior disorder and 31.0% were reported to have a psychiatric condition. About 65% of all residents (64.8%) were reported to have 2 or more of these conditions. In comparison in 1977, 6.0% of state institution residents were blind, 3.6% were deaf, 32.5% had epilepsy, 19.3% had cerebral palsy, 25.4% were reported to have a behavior disorder and 35.1% to have two or more of these conditions.

Males remained a substantial majority among large state facility residents. Males made up 60.0% of state facility populations. Males have made up a majority of state facility residents since the first national survey reporting gender statistics in 1904 when 53.1% of state institution residents were male. That proportion has very gradually increased over the years to 57.0% in 1977, 57.4% in 1982, 57.7% in 1987, and 58.5% in 1991.

All State and Non-State Residential Services

Number of Size and Residential Settings

The number of residential settings for persons with MR/DD is growing very rapidly. On June 30, 1996 there were 86,225 residential settings in which persons with MR/DD received residential services from state operated or state licensed residential service providers (excluding psychiatric facilities, nursing homes and people receiving services while living with family members). Since 1977 the number of settings in which people receive residential services has grown nearly eight-fold. On June 30, 1977 there were 11,008 state licensed or state operated residential service settings; on June 30, 1982 there were 15,632; on June 30, 1987 there were 33,477; on June 30, 1991 there were 46,786, and on June 30, 1995 there were 84,532 Of all residential service settings on June 30, 1996, 1,847 were operated by states, with the remaining 84,378 residential settings served by nonstate agencies.

Most residences licensed or operated by states for persons with MR/DD were small and almost all people living in small residences were served by nonstate agencies. Of the 86,225 total residential settings on June 30, 1996, 84,652 had 15 or fewer residents (98.2%) and 78,365 had 6 or fewer residents (90.9%). The 83,057 nonstate settings with 15 or fewer residents made up 98.1% of all settings with 15 or fewer residents. The 77,457 nonstate settings with 6 or fewer residents made up virtually all (98.8%) of the settings with 6 or fewer residents.

Most large residences were also operated by nonstate agencies. Nonstate agencies operated 1,239 (83.1%) of the total 1,491 facilities with 16 or more residents. This compares to 80.8% in 1977 and 82.7% in 1987.

Number of Residents

Between 1977 and 1996, there was a steady increase in the total number of persons with MR/DD receiving residential services. Between 1977 and 1996 the total number of residential service recipients grew 40.0%, from 247,780 to a reported 324,567. Total population increases (both nonstate and state settings) were limited to places with 15 or fewer residents, the populations of which increased by an estimated 188,807 persons between 1977 and 1996. Total populations of facilities with 16 or more residents decreased by 112,020 persons between 1977 and 1996. Between 1995 and 1996 residents of settings with 15 and fewer residents increased by an estimated 14,856 persons, while residents of places with 16 or more residents decreased by 3,996.

The national average rate of placement in residential settings for persons with MR/DD in 1996 based on reported populations was 122.0 persons per 100,000 of the general population. Twenty-seven states reported residential placement rates at or above the national average, with the highest rate (295.8 per 100,000 state residents) in North Dakota. The lowest placement rate (43.0 per 100,000) was reported by Nevada. Eight states reported placement rates 150% or more of the national average and three states reported placement rate 50% or less of the national average. The national average placement rate of 122.0 in 1996 was slightly higher than the 1995 rate of 118.7 and the 1977 rate of 118.8.

In 1996 about 70.5% of the persons with MR/DD receiving residential services lived in places with 15 or fewer residents 53.0% lived in places with 6 or fewer residents, and 24.9% lived in places with 3 or fewer residents. On June 30, 1996, residences of 15 or fewer persons housed 228,929 people (70.5% of all residents). Settings with 6 or fewer residents housed 172,540 people (53.2% of all residents) settings with 3 or fewer people (adjusted for 4 non reporting states) housed an estimated 80,430 residents (24.9% of all residents). Of the 228,929 persons living in places with 15 or fewer residents, 218,272 (95.3%) lived in settings operated by nonstate agencies. The 168,671 persons living in nonstate settings with 6 or fewer residents made up almost all (97.8%) of the 172,540 people living in places with 6 or fewer residents.

A substantial majority of persons with MR/DD who received residential services from nonstate agencies lived in smaller settings while a substantial majority of persons who lived in state residences lived in large facilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

More than four-fifths (85.5%) of the 255,288 persons receiving residential services from nonstate agencies lived in settings of 15 or fewer residents, and nearly two thirds (66.0%) lived in settings with 6 or fewer residents. Almost nine of ten (84.6%) of the 68,692 persons living in state operated settings were in facilities with 16 or more residents. Of the 95,343 residents of residential settings with 16 or more residents, 58,320 (61.2%) lived in state facilities. In 1977, 74.6% of the 207,356 residents of facilities with 16 or more residents lived in state facilities.

Interstate Variability

In 8 states a majority of the reported 324,567 persons with MR/DD receiving residential services lived in facilities of 16 or more residents. On June 30, 1996 more than half of the residents of all settings in Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Texas, and Virginia lived in facilities with 16 or more residents. Nationally, 29.5% of all residential service recipients lived in settings of 16 or more residents.

In nearly two-thirds (31) of all states a majority of the estimated population of persons with MR/DD received residential services in settings with 6 or fewer residents. On June 30, 1996 more than half of the residents of all settings in Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming lived in settings with 6 or fewer residents. Nationally, 53.2% of all residential service recipients lived in settings of 6 or fewer residents, and an estimated 24.9% lived in settings with 3 or fewer residents with MR/DD.

State and Nonstate Residential Settings by Type

Most people receiving residential services receive it in places that provide "congregate care." Congregate care is provided in settings owned, rented or managed by the residential services provider, or the provider's agents in which paid staff provide care, supervisory instruction and other support. An estimated 250,452 persons with MR/DD lived in congregate care settings on June 30, 1996 (77.2% of all residential service recipients). A majority of these persons (156,940 or 62.7%) lived in settings with 15 or fewer residents and over two-thirds of those (100,915 or 64.3%) lived in settings with 6 or fewer residents.

The number of people living in "family foster care" is slowly increasing. An estimated national total of 22,969 persons with MR/DD lived in family foster care settings on June 30, 1996. Virtually all (99.8%) lived in homes with 6 or fewer residents. Between June 30, 1982 and June 30, 1996 the estimated number of people in foster care settings increased from approximately 17,150 to 22,969 (33.9%).

About 14% of persons receiving MR/DD residential services live in their "own homes" that they own or lease. An estimated national total of 45,012 persons with MR/DD receiving residential services and supports lived in homes that they owned or leased for themselves. All of these people lived with six or fewer other persons. Between 1991 and 1996 the estimated number of people living in homes of their own nationally increased by about 19,000 persons as the movement toward consumer controlled housing and supported living continued to gain momentum.

Patterns of Change in Residential Service Systems: 1977-1996

The number of residential settings in which people received services increased much faster than the total number of service recipients. Between 1977 and 1996, the total number of residential settings in which people with MR/DD received residential services grew from 11,008 to over 86,225 (683%), while total service recipients increased by 30.9%, from about 248,000 to an estimated 324,567 individuals.

The nation moved from large facility-centered to small community-based residential services. In 1977, 83.7% of the estimated population of persons with MR/DD receiving residential services lived in residences of 16 or more people. By 1996, an estimated 70.5% lived in community settings of 15 or fewer people, and 53.0% lived in

residential settings with 6 or fewer people. But only about 13.0% of residential service recipients lived in homes that they themselves owned or rented (11.9% counting persons with MR/DD living in nursing homes).

The role of the state as a residential service provider dramatically declined. In 1977, 62.9% of all residential service recipients lived in state-operated residential settings. By 1996, less than one-quarter (21.4%) of all residential service recipients lived in state-operated residential settings.

The number of persons with MR/DD living in settings of 3 or fewer persons continues to increase. An estimated 75,146 people (23.1%) were living in homes of 3 or fewer residents in 1996, an increase of 379% from 15,702 (6.4%) in 1982. Among 47 states for which this data was available, persons with MR/DD living in settings of 3 or fewer persons ranged from 1.1% to 85.0% of all persons with MR/DD receiving residential services.

States reported a large number of service recipients living in their family homes. In 1996, states reported an estimated 265,613 persons receiving services in their family homes. This accounts for 45% of all residential services provided. Recipients of family-based services in states ranged from 0% to 77% of service recipients.

States reported 51,553 persons waiting for residential services. An estimated 26.9% growth in Medicaid expenditures nationally is needed to provide residential services to all of those on waiting lists. The range of growth needed in states ranges from 0% to 89.9%.

Medicaid Funded Services

Intermediate Care Facilities for Persons with Mental Retardation (ICFs-MR)

The total number of ICFs-MR has increased by 136 facilities, limited to places of 6 or fewer residents. On June 30, 1996 there were 7,083 ICFs-MR nationwide. In 1995, 6,947 ICFs-MR were reported. Average ICF-MR size in 1996 was 18.3 residents; this compares with 186 residents in 1977, 74.5 residents in 1982; and 37 residents in 1987.

In 1996, the population of ICFs-MR continued to decrease. From 1982 to 1993 the ICF-MR program was notable for its stability in the number of persons served. On June 30, 1994 there were 142,118 persons living in all ICFs-MR. This compares with 140,684 on June 30, 1982. By June 1995 the total ICF-MR population had decreased to 134,384. The June 1996 population of ICF-MR was 129,449, a decrease of 4,935 from the previous year.

Populations of large ICFs-MR with 16 or more residents have continued to decrease steadily over the past several years. On June 30, 1996 there were 85,109 persons in ICFs-MR of 16 or more residents (65.7% of all ICF-MR residents). This represented a 29.2% decrease from the 120,822 persons in large ICFs-MR in 1987 and a 34.9% decrease from 130,767 large ICF-MR residents in 1982. The 1996 population of large ICFs-MR included 56,877 residents of state ICFs-MR and 28,232 residents in nonstate ICFs-MR. Between June 30, 1987 and June 30, 1996, large state ICF-MR populations decreased 35.7% (from 88,424), while large nonstate ICF-MR populations decreased by 9.3% (from 32,398). In 1996, 89.3% of persons living in all large state and nonstate facilities lived in ICF-MR units, and 97.5% of people living in state facilities of 16 or more residents lived in ICF-MR units.

In 1996, a minority of ICF-MR residents were living in state-operated facilities. On June 30, 1996, 44.9% of all ICF-MR residents were living in state-operated facilities. This compares with 63.2% on June 30, 1987; 77.2% on June 30, 1982 and 87.5% on June 30, 1977. The decreased concentration of ICF-MR residents in state-operated facilities is associated with the general depopulation of large state MR/DD facilities and the increase in the number of community ICFs-MR, 97.3% of which in 1996 were nonstate facilities. On June 30, 1996 there were 56,877 persons in ICF-MR units of large state MR/DD facilities (43.9% of all ICF-MR residents). This compares with 88,424 persons on June 30, 1987 (61.2% of all ICF-MR residents), and 107,081 persons in June 30, 1982 (76.3% of all ICF-MR residents).

The number of residents of ICFs-MR of 15 or fewer residents continued to decrease in 1996, along with the large decrease in total ICF-MR residents. On June 30, 1996 there were 44,340 persons with MR/DD living in ICFs-MR with 15 or fewer residents. This represents a decrease of 2.0% from June 30, 1995. Still community ICFs-MR continued to house many more people than the 23,528 persons on June 30, 1987, and the 9,985 on June 30, 1982. On June 30, 1996, 44.9% of residents of small ICFs-MR lived in facilities with 6 or fewer residents. Between June 30, 1982 and June 30, 1996 the total number of persons with MR/DD living in ICFs-MR of six or fewer residents increased from 2,572 to 19,928. But the number of people living in ICFs-MR of 6 or fewer residents decreased between June 30, 1995 and June 30, 1996 by 628 residents (3.1%) as many small ICFs-MR were converted to Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) waiver financing.

A relatively small proportion of persons with MR/DD living in the community settings live in ICF-MR certified residences. Nationally, on June 30, 1996 only 19.5% of the 227,668 persons in settings with 15 or fewer residents lived in ICFs-MR. Persons living in settings with 7 to 15 residents were far more likely to live in ICFs-MR than persons living in settings of 6 or fewer residents; 24,412 (43.3%) of the 56,374 persons living in settings with 7 to 15 residents lived in ICFs-MR, while only 19,928 (11.6%) of the 171,294 persons living in settings with 6 or fewer residents lived in ICFs-MR.

In 1996 total ICF-MR expenditures increased slightly over 1994. In Fiscal Year 1996 total federal and state expenditures for ICF-MR services were 9.73 billion dollars, while Fiscal Year 1995 expenditures totaled 9.67 billion dollars. This compares with $8.8 billion dollars in 1992, $5.6 billion in 1987, $3.6 billion in 1982 and $1.1 billion in 1977.

Per resident ICF-MR expenditures in 1996 continued to increase. In 1996 the average expenditure for end-of-year ICF-MR residents was $75,192. This compares with the average 1995 per recipient expenditure of $70,941. The average 1996 expenditure was $30,246 or 67.3% more than the 1989 per recipient expenditure of $44,946. States varied substantially in expenditures per ICF-MR recipient, from over $100,000 per year in twelve states to under $45,000 per year in two states. Total ICF-MR expenditures per day per person in the general population averaged $36.59 per year nationally. Five states spent over twice the national average.

Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS)

Growth in HCBS recipients continues. On June 30, 1996 there were 190,230 persons with MR/DD receiving HCBS, and increase of 27.5% over the 149,185 recipients on June 30, 1995. In the six years between June 30, 1990 and 1996, the number of HCBS recipients grew 377.5% from 39,838 and the number of states providing HCBS increased from 42 to 51. Thirty-four states increased their number of HCBS recipients by 1,000 or more between 1990 and 1996.

People receiving HCBS financed residential services (other than room and board) is greater than the number living in ICFs-MR. Of the 50 states with HCBS recipients, 35 were able to report the residential arrangements of all or some of their recipients. These states reported residential arrangements for 89,894 individuals, 47.3% of 190,230 HCBS recipients on June 30, 1996. More than 7 of 10 (70.9%) of these HCBS recipients were receiving residential services outside their family home. Applying this statistic to all 190,230 HCBS recipients on June 30, 1996 yields an estimated 134,873 persons receiving residential services funded by HCBS while living away from the home or their parents or other relatives. This estimate suggests that in Fiscal Year 1996, for the first time more people were receiving out-of-home Medicaid long-term care services financed by the HCBS program (134,873 persons) than financed by the ICF-MR program (129,449 persons). In a residential facility or foster home, almost twice the 45,234 persons served in all small ICFs-MR.

Expenditures for Medicaid HCBS recipients continue to grow and show substantial interstate variability. In Fiscal Year 1996 expenditures for Medicaid HCBS recipients were 4.7 billion dollars for 190,230 recipients, a per recipient average of $24,783 per year. This represents a 16.6% increase over the per recipient average in Fiscal Year

1990 ($21,246). The states with the highest per recipient expenditures in 1996 were Delaware ($65,088) and Pennsylvania ($56,073). The states with the lowest per recipients expenditures in 1996 were California ($10,799), Florida ($11,385), Illinois ($11,094) and Mississippi ($397). Adjustments in average expenditures to reflect estimated average daily HCBS recipients yields an average expenditure of $27,779.

ICF-MR and HCBS Combined

Despite decreasing numbers of ICF-MR residents, growth in the total number of ICF-MR and HCBS recipients has continued at a rapidly accelerating rate. Between 1982 and 1987 combined totals of ICF-MR and HCBS recipients increased at an annual average of about 6,200. Between 1987 and 1992 there was a combined average annual increase of approximately 8,000 ICF-MR and HCBS recipients. Between 1992 and 1996 total ICF-MR and HCBS recipients increased at an annual rate of more than 25,000 per year. On June 30, 1996, HCBS recipients made up 59.5% of the combined total of ICF-MR and HCBS recipients, compared with just 13.6% on June 30, 1987.

ICF-MR and HCBS recipients living in small (15 or fewer residents) residential settings make up nearly three-quarters of the combined total of ICF-MR and HCBS recipients. On June 30, 1996 residents of small ICFs-MR and HCBS recipients made up 73.4% of all ICF-MR and HCBS recipients. That compares with 68.6% on June 30, 1995, 64.5% on June 30, 1994, and 27.7% on June 30, 1987. In 45 states most of the combined ICF-MR and HCBS recipients were receiving community services.

There remains remarkable variation among states in ICF-MR and HCBS utilization rates. On June 30, 1996 there was a national ICF-MR utilization rate of 48.7 ICF-MR residents per 100,000 persons in the United States. The highest individual state ICF-MR utilization rates were 135.9 in District of Columbia and 139.2 in Louisiana. The highest utilization of large ICFs-MR were in Illinois (60.6), Louisiana (72.5), Mississippi (72.2), Oklahoma (67.9), and Wisconsin (64.7). State HCBS utilization rates varied from twice the national average of 71.5 in 8 states to less than half of the national average in 12 states. On June 30, 1996 nationally there was an average of combined 120.2 ICF-MR and HCBS recipients per 100,000 of the population. Individual state utilization rates for the combined programs varied from the highest rates in North Dakota (375.2), South Dakota (221.6), New York (215.1), Rhode Island (213.9) and Wyoming (204.4) to the lowest rates in Alaska (38.5) and Nevada (39.0).

Expenditures are disproportionately greater in ICFs/MR than for persons receiving HCBS. The average annual expenditures for ICF-MR services were $75,192 per person as compared to $24,783 per each HCBS recipient. As a result nationally, in Fiscal Year 1996, HCBS recipients made up 59.5% of the total HCBS and ICF-MR recipient population but used only 32.6% of the total HCBS and ICF-MR expenditures. In sixteen states HCBS expenditures exceeded ICF-MR expenditures.

Differences in state benefits from Medicaid spending continues. Almost any measure of each states' relative benefits from Medicaid funding yields significant interstate differences. For example, if 1996 Medicaid long-term care benefits paid to each state for persons with MR/DD are indexed by federal income tax paid by citizens of each state, major differences are found. In 1996, six states received over twice their relative federal income contributions tax back in benefits (North Dakota, $3.06 in benefits per $1.00 contributed; Louisiana, $2.60; South Dakota, $2.18; Rhode Island, $2.02; New Mexico ($2.11) and New York ($2.04). Six states received back less than half their relative contributions (Alaska, California, Florida, Hawaii, Nevada, Virginia). There are also large differences among states indexed in Medicaid expenditures for persons with MR/DD. For example, in Fiscal Year 1996, the District of Columbia, New York, North Dakota, and Rhode Island spent more than $100 for Medicaid long-term care programs for persons with MR/DD per state resident. Alaska, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky and Nevada spent less than $25.

Nineteen states reported a total of 1,039 completed or planned direct conversions of ICFs-MR to HCBS residences. States have completed and are planning conversions of ICF-MR financed residences to HCBS financed residences in numbers equal to about 20% of the June 1995 community ICFs-MR. New York has had the greatest number of actual conversions of ICFs-MR to HCBS funding (305). Pennsylvania has also planned approximately 300 direct conversions.

Nursing Home Residents

The number of persons with MR/DD in Nursing Facilities continues to decrease slowly. States reported that on June 30, 1996 there were 37,591 persons with MR/DD in nursing homes. This compares with 36,197 on June 30, 1994. Nationwide, in 1996 9.7% of all persons with MR/DD receiving residential services and 10.5% of all with MR/DD receiving services through Medicaid ICF-MR, HCBS or Nursing Facility programs were in Medicaid nursing homes. One state reported Nursing Facility residents make up more than one-third of their citizens with MR/DD receiving residential services and two other states reported Nursing Facility residents to make up more than one-fifth of Medicaid long-term service recipients with MR/DD.

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The National Residential Information Systems Project (RISP) on Residential Services of the Research and Training Center on Residential Services and Community Living began in 1977. It has operated on a nearly continuous basis since then. This project gathers and reports statistics on persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD) receiving residential services, both state-operated and nonstate-operated, Medicaid-funded and non-Medicaid funded programs in the United States, including residential services operated specifically for persons with MR/DD, as well as persons with MR/DD who are living in nursing homes, and state psychiatric facilities. This particular report provides such statistics for the year ending June 30, 1996, as well as comparative statistics from earlier years.

Section I of this report presents statistics on state-operated residential services for Fiscal Year 1996, with comparative trend data from earlier years. Chapter 1 presents statistics that were compiled and reported by various state agencies. The data collection in Chapter 1 represents a continuation of a statistical program originated by the Office of Mental Retardation Coordination (now the Administration on Developmental Disabilities) in 1968 which gathered statistics on state MR/DD institutions (places with 16 or more residents). It has since been expanded to include statistics on smaller state-operated MR/DD residential settings (those with fewer than 15 residents) and on state-operated psychiatric facilities which house persons with mental retardation and related conditions. The addition of state psychiatric facilities was begun for Fiscal Year 1978, and the smaller state-operated residential settings were added in Fiscal Year 1986. As is indicated at various points throughout this report the statistics gathered as part of the National Residential Information Systems Project since Fiscal Year 1977 have also been linked to a longitudinal data base developed by the project including statistics on residents and expenditures of individual large (16 or more residents) state MR/DD residential facilities on June 30, 1996. That data base begins with the first census of state MR/DD institutions carried out as part of the U.S. Census of 1880.

Section I, Chapter 2 presents the Fiscal Year 1996 statistics as part of the longitudinal trends in state institution populations, resident movement, and expenditures for state institution care since 1950. A brief historical review of these and other preceding surveys since 1950 can be found in Lakin, Hill, Street, and Bruininks (1986). For a more detailed review, including surveys and statistics since 1880, see Lakin (1979).

Section I, Chapter 3 presents information on average and end of Fiscal Year 1996 populations with MR/DD, average per diem expenditures during Fiscal Year 1996 by institution and patterns of state institution closure. It provides a listing of all state institutions that have operated since 1960, including those that closed on or before 1996, and those that are scheduled to close by 2000. These statistics were gathered through the survey of individual state facilities including traditional state MR/DD institutions and MR/DD units contained within state psychiatric or other "mixed use" institutions.

Section I, Chapter 4 presents statistics on the characteristics and movement of residents of large state MR/DD residential institutions (16 or more residents) in Fiscal Year 1996. These statistics were gathered through a survey of individual state institutions for persons with mental retardation and related conditions with 16 or more residents. These facilities included traditional state MR/DD institutions and MR/DD units contained within other state-operated institutions. Previous surveys of state institutions were conducted in conjunction with this project in 1977, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, and 1994. As in the past these statistics were gathered in cooperation with the Association of Public Developmental Disabilities Administrators (formerly the National Association of Superintendents of Public Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded). The procedures for this survey were developed by the late Richard Scheerenberger.

Section II of this report presents combined statistics on the total numbers of persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities in both state and nonstate residential settings. Statistics in this section have been compiled and reported by individual state MR/DD agencies. This data set was designed in cooperation with state agencies to permit the most comprehensive possible data collection while maintaining congruence with administrative data sets maintained in each of the states. It should be noted that in certain states a significant amount of state effort is required to compile the requested statistics, including frequently separate surveys of substate

regions. Occasionally the demands of such data collection activities preclude a state's reporting completely for a particular year. In such states statistics from the most recent data collection point have been substituted for Fiscal Year 1996 data. When earlier data are substituted, they are so indicated in the tables presented.

Section II provides longitudinal trend statistics on total (i.e., state-operated and nonstate- operated) MR/DD residential service systems on the individual state and national levels. Section II, Chapter 5 provides data on total state residential services systems (i.e., services provided by both state and nonstate agencies). These statistics are reported by state/nonstate operation and by size of residential settings on June 30, 1996. State-operated services include those described in Chapter 1 with the exception of the psychiatric institutions, which are excluded in Section II's focus on the individual state and national MR/DD residential services systems. Although nonstate facilities are almost entirely privately operated, in a few states local government agencies also operate residential programs. These local government programs are included with private programs in a nonstate category because typically their relationship with the state with respect to licensing, monitoring and funding is more like that of a private agency than that of a state-operated program. In addition to state/nonstate operation, four residential setting size distinctions are provided: 1 to 3 residents, 4 to 6 residents, 7 to 15 residents and 16 or more residents. Again these size categories were established because they were most congruent with the data that the individual states were able to report.

Chapter 6 presents statistics reported by the various states on residents living in different types of residential settings of state and nonstate operation. Four separate categories of residential settings are identified. These were developed after consultation with state respondents during a 1986 feasibility study of states' abilities to report residents by setting type. Without question this area presents states with the greatest reporting challenge. States have in total literally hundreds of different names for residential programs and many of these programs have aspects which make them subtly different from similarly named programs in other states. Even in using just the four broad residential setting categories identified below, a few state data systems do not permit the breakdowns requested. Therefore in some states some residential settings and their residents must be subsumed in the statistics of another setting type.

Chapter 7 presents Fiscal Year 1996 statistics along with longitudinal statistics from earlier years to show the changing patterns of residential services for persons with MR/DD from 1977 to 1996. This presentation of statistics focuses on overall residential service utilization as well as the utilization of residential settings of different state/nonstate operation, size and type.

Section III focuses on the utilization of the Medicaid program to sponsor long-term care services for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities. Chapter 8 describes the evolution of Medicaid involvement in services for persons with mental retardation and related conditions and the specific programs funding residential services for persons with MR/DD. Chapter 9 provides statistics on June 30, 1996 utilization of these Medicaid programs. It also presents Fiscal Year 1996 statistics within the longitudinal context of changing Medicaid utilization. This presentation also includes Medicaid residential services program utilization within the entire system of residential services for persons with mental retardation and related conditions. Chapter 10 provides a description of states' policies and practices related to the conversion of community ICFs-MR to Home and Community Based Services waiver sites. It is based on a separate survey of state officials involved in the administration of the HCBS program.

Section IV provides state-by-state trends in residential services. Chapter 11 in this section provides individual state summaries from 1977 to 1996 of changes in residential services by facility size, service recipients per 100,000 of state population and other descriptors for use in monitoring trends and comparing states.

METHODOLOGY

The contents of this report primarily derive from three data collection activities. The first is a four-part survey of designated state agencies and key respondents to gather aggregated state statistics. The second is a survey of administrators of all large (16 or more residents) state MR/DD facilities. The third is a survey of administrators of Medicaid Home and Community Based Services programs.

State Survey Data Collection

A four-part survey questionnaire for state agency statistics for Fiscal Year 1996, was mailed with a cover letter to each state's mental retardation/developmental disabilities program director or the state's designated "key data manager" in September 1996. Part 1 of the questionnaire was on state-operated residential services. Part 2 gathered statistics on nonstate residential settings and persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities residing in Medicaid nursing facilities. Statistics on ICFs-MR were integrated into Parts 1 and 2. Part 3 contained questions on Medicaid Home and Community Based Services. Part 4 requested the number of persons with MR/DD on waiting lists for residential services. Telephone follow-up began two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed to confirm the individual(s) in each state agency who had accepted responsibility for compiling the statistics for each part of the survey. Direct contacts were then made with each key data manager to answer questions about the data requested.

Additional follow-up telephone calls to promote initial response and to clarify and edit the statistics on returned questionnaires continued and summaries of the data from each state were returned to each state for verification. Reporting and special notes on state data were completed by the end of February 1996. Compiling statistics from states on the four-part survey took an average of four telephone conversations involving up to four different people in each state. In several states contacts were made with two or more of the mental retardation/developmental disabilities, mental health and Medicaid agencies to gather the required statistics.

Limitations are encountered when gathering statistics at the state level. Most notable among these are the variations that sometimes exist in the types of statistics maintained by the various states and the specific operational definitions governing certain data elements. For example, in a few states data on first admissions, readmissions, and releases were not available according to the specific survey definitions. In a few other states the state statistical systems were not wholly compatible with the uniform data collection of this project. General problems in the collection of the data are presented in the discussion accompanying each table in the body of the report and/or in notes at the foot of tables.

Individual State Institution Survey

Data in Chapter 4 of this report present results from a survey of each large (16 or more residents) state MR/DD residential facility or unit operating on June 30, 1996. This survey included questions on demographic, diagnostic, and functional characteristics of each facility's residents, on patterns of resident movement, including previous place of residence of new admissions and readmissions to each state-operated residential facility, and on program administration, staffing and expenditures.

The facilities included in this study were large state residential facilities for persons with MR/DD or specifically designated units for persons with MR/DD within other institutions. Data collection was carried out primarily by mail with telephone follow-up to nonrespondents. Two instruments were used in this survey. They included a long form (22 categories of information) initially mailed to all facilities (returned by 166 facilities, 75.8% responding facilities), and a short form (10 categories of information) mailed to all nonrespondents to the long form (returned by 23 facilities, 10.5%). A phone follow-up was conducted with the 13.7% facilities that failed to respond to either the long or short form of this survey. Statistics were obtained from these institutions on their number of residents with MR/DD on June 30, 1996, their average daily population during Fiscal Year 1996, their average per diem expenditures in Fiscal Year 1996 and their plans, if any, for closure between 1996-2000. Specific item response rates are indicated at the foot of each table. These report the percentage of all state MR/DD institution residents who are housed in the facilities that reported the specific statistic.

Survey on ICF-MR to HCBS Conversion

Chapter 10 is based on a survey of states and the District of Columbia regarding conversions of community ICF-MR facilities to HCBS financed residential sites. The survey's three part questionnaire were faxed to all state developmental disabilities directors in October 1996 with the request that the questionnaire be referred to the appropriate respondent. A response was requested within 10 days and nonrespondents were subsequently contacted by telephone. Forty-nine of 50 states and the District of Columbia responded to the survey. One state did not respond on the advice of state attorneys because of current litigation involving this issue.

SECTION I

STATUS AND CHANGES IN STATE-OPERATED RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

CHAPTER 1
POPULATIONS OF STATE-OPERATED RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS IN 1996

Lynda Anderson
Barbara Polister
Robert W. Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin
Jennifer Sandlin

The statistics in this chapter on resident populations, resident movement, and costs in state-operated residential settings for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD) in Fiscal Year 1996 were gathered in a survey of all states. Statistics are provided for persons residing in state-operated MR/DD settings of 6 or fewer residents, 7-15 residents and 16 or more residents, and for persons with MR/DD residing in state-operated psychiatric facilities. A state-operated setting is defined as one in which the persons providing direct support to the residents of the setting are state employees.

Number of State-Operated Residential Facilities

Table 1.1 presents statistics by state on the number of state-operated residential facilities serving persons with MR/DD in the United States on June 30, 1996. The statistics are broken down for state-operated MR/DD settings with 6 or fewer residents, 7-15 residents, and 16 or more residents; and for state-operated psychiatric facilities and total state-operated facilities.

On June 30, 1996, states reported a total of 1,911 state-operated residential settings serving persons with MR/DD, a decrease of 35 from the previous year. Of these, 1,847 (96.7%) were settings primarily for persons with MR/DD. Of the 1,847 state MR/DD facilities, 1,595 (86.4%) had 15 or fewer residents; 252 (13.6%) had 16 or more residents.

All states except New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia operated at least one large state MR/DD facility on June 30, 1996. Twelve states reported at least one psychiatric facility housing persons with a primary diagnosis of mental retardation or a related developmental disability in units other than special MR/DD units (the latter being counted among the "MR/DD facilities"). States reported a total of 64 state psychiatric facilities with residents with MR/DD as compared with 89 on June 30, 1995.

On June 30, 1996, 15 states were serving persons with MR/DD in state-operated settings with 15 or fewer total residents. The total of 1,595 small residential settings staffed by state employees on June 30, 1996 represented an increase of 4.7% (71 settings) between June 30, 1995 and June 30, 1996. By far the greatest portion of that growth came among settings with 6 or fewer residents, which grew by 5.2% (45 settings).

The greatest number of small state-operated residential settings was in New York (935 settings). New York operated 58.6% of all such settings in the United States on June 30, 1996. Slightly more than half (53.6%) of New York's state-operated community residential facilities had between 7 and 15 residents. Outside of New York, among states with small state-operated residential settings, more than two thirds (71.8%) of the 660 state-operated community residential settings in 1996 had 6 or fewer residents.

Table 1.1 Number of State-Operated Residential Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State

State	State MR/DD Facilities							Psychiatric Facilities	Total Large Facilities (16+)	Total State
	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total			
AL	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	5
AK	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
AZ	5	17	22	8	30	1	31	0	1	31
AR	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	6	6
CA	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	7	7
CO	2	0	2	36	38	2	40	0	2	40
CT	75	48	123	37	160	11	171	2	13	173
DE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	8	8
GA	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	3 a	8	8
HI	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
ID	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
IL	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	2	13	13
IN	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	1	8	8
IA	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	6	6
KS	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3
KY	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3
LA	0	13	13	0	13	9	22	0	9	22
ME	0	0	0	4	4	1	5	0	1	5
MD	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5 a	10	10
MA	0	71	71	61	132	7	139	0	7	139
MI	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3
MN	0	47	47	0	47	5	52	0	5	52
MS	63	32	95	23	118	5	123	0	5	123
MO	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	8	14	14
MT	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2
NE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
NV	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	0	2	4
NH	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	3	3	5
NJ	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	7	15	15
NM	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
NY	90	344	434	501	935	45	980	15 e,a	45	980
NC	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	5
ND	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
OH	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	12	12
OK	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3
OR	2	7	9	0	9	2	11	0	2	11
PA	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	13	24	24
RI	0	35	35	13	48	0	48	0	0	48
SC	8	0	8	0	8	5	13	0	5	13
SD	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2
TN	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	5
TX	0	46	46	3	49	13	62	0	13	62
UT	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
VT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VA	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	5
WA	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	5	5
WV	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
WI	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3	3
WY	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
U.S. Total	247	661	908	687	1595	252	1847	64	316	1,911

a indicates 1995 data

e indicates estimate

Table 1.2 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in State-Operated MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State

	State MR/DD Facilities									
State	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16 +	Total	Psychiatric Facilities	Total Large (16+)	Total State
AL	0	0	0	0	0	800	800	0	800	800
AK	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	19	19
AZ	15	85	100	94	194	103	297	0	103	297
AR	0	0	0	0	0	1,272	1,272	0	1,272	1,272
CA	0	0	0	0	0	4,581	4,581	0	4,581	4,581
CO	4	0	4	294	298	197	495	0	197	495
CT	198	258	456	284	740	1,209	1,949	15	1,224	1,964
DE	0	0	0	15	15	291	306	0	291	306
DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL	0	0	0	0	0	1,459	1,459	0	1,459	1,459
GA	0	0	0	0	0	1,909	1,909	36 a	1,909	1,909
HI	0	0	0	0	0	49	49	0	49	49
ID	0	0	0	0	0	123	123	0	123	123
IL	0	0	0	0	0	3,718	3,718	17 a	3,735	3,735
IN	0	0	0	0	0	1,244	1,244	65	1,309	1,309
IA	0	0	0	0	0	672	672	197	869	869
KS	0	0	0	0	0	676	676	0	676	676
KY	0	0	0	0	0	644	644	0	644	644
LA	0	78	78	0	78	2,031	2,109	0	2,031	2,109
ME	0	0	0	48	48	19	67	0	19	67
MD	0	0	0	0	0	652	652	8 a	660	660
MA	0	280	280	488	768	1,824	2,592	0	1,824	2,592
MI	0	0	0	0	0	346	346	0	346	346
MN	0	222	222	0	222	345	567	0	345	567
MS	101	169	270	225	495	1,424	1,919	0	1,424	1,919
MO	0	0	0	0	0	1,494	1,494	41	1,535	1,535
MT	0	0	0	0	0	157	157	0	157	157
NE	0	0	0	0	0	401	401	0	401	401
NV	0	6	6	12	18	154	172	0	154	172
NH	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	6	6	10
NJ	0	0	0	0	0	4,241	4,241	691 b	4,241	4,241
NM	0	0	0	0	0	145	145	0	145	145
NY	242	1,692	1934	5,143	7,077	3,399	10,476	150 e,a	3,399	10,476
NC	0	0	0	0	0	2,227	2,227	0	2,227	2,227
ND	0	0	0	0	0	148	148	0	148	148
OH	0	0	0	0	0	2,087	2,087	0	2,087	2,087
OK	0	0	0	0	0	553	553	0	553	553
OR	3	35	38	0	38	429	467	0	429	467
PA	0	0	0	0	0	3,164	3,164	27	3,191	3,191
RI	0	204	204	150	354	0	354	0	0	354
SC	22	0	22	0	22	1,548	1,570	0	1,548	1,570
SD	0	0	0	0	0	252	252	16	268	268
TN	0	0	0	0	0	1,388	1,388	0	1,388	1,388
TX	0	251	251	35	286	5,735	6,021	0	5,735	6,021 c
UT	0	0	0	0	0	311	311	0	311	311
VT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VA	0	0	0	0	0	2,189	2,189	0	2,189	2,189
WA	0	0	0	0	0	1,281	1,281	0	1,281	1,281
WV	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	0	75	75
WI	0	0	0	0	0	1,197	1,197	0	1,197	1,197
WY	0	0	0	0	0	145	145	0	145	145
U.S. Total	589	3,280	3,869	6,773	10,642	58,320	68,962	1,269	59,589	70,231

a indicates 1995 data b indicates 1993 data c indicates information from survey of large Public Residential Facilities

e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Residents of State-Operated Facilities

Table 1.2 presents the number of persons with MR/DD living in state-operated MR/DD residential settings and psychiatric facilities on June 30, 1996. On June 30, 1996 there were 70,231 persons with MR/DD living in state-operated residential settings. This represented a decrease of about 4.3% from the 73,374 residents on June 30, 1995. Of this population, 68,962 persons (98.2%) were residents of settings specifically designated for persons with MR/DD and 1,269 persons (1.8%) were residents of psychiatric facilities.

Of the 68,962 persons living in state-operated MR/DD facilities, 3,869 (5.6%) lived in settings of six or fewer residents, 6,773 (9.8%) lived in facilities of seven to 15 residents, and 58,320 (84.6%) lived in large facilities of 16 or more residents. Nationally, the populations of large state-operated MR/DD facilities decreased 6.0% between June 30, 1995 and June 30, 1996 from 62,028 residents on June 30, 1995. All residents with MR/DD living in state-operated psychiatric facilities were in settings of 16 or more residents.

The 3,869 persons with MR/DD in state-operated MR/DD settings of six or fewer residents were in fourteen states, with 2,390 (61.8%) concentrated in two states (Connecticut and New York). The 6,773 persons in MR/DD facilities of seven to 15 residents were in 10 states and 5,143 (75.9%) were from New York. Of the 58,320 persons living in large state MR/DD facilities, 24,838 (42.6%) lived in six states (California, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas).

The decrease in the number of residents of large state MR/DD facilities continued a trend first evident in Fiscal Year 1968. The 6.0% rate of decrease between Fiscal Years 1995 and 1996 compares with a 5.6% decrease between Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, 5.8% decrease between Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994, a 6.4% decrease between Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 and a 7.5% decrease between Fiscal Years 1991 and 1992.

Populations per 100,000 of the General Population

Table 1.3 indexes the population of persons with MR/DD living in state-operated residential settings by 100,000 of each state's general population on June 30, 1996. This statistic is referred to here as the "placement rate." On June 30, 1996 the national placement rate for all state-operated residential settings was 26.4 residents per 100,000 of state population. This represented a reduction from 31.9 on June 30, 1993, 30.1 on June 30, 1994, and 27.9 on June, 30, 1995. This decrease in national placement rate for all state-operated residential services was due to the decrease in national placement rate for large state MR/DD facilities, from 27.3 on June 30, 1993 to 25.5 on June 30, 1994 to 23.5 on June 30, 1995 to 21.9 on June 30, 1996. During the same period the placement rate for state-operated MR/DD residential settings of 15 or fewer residents varied only slightly within the range 3.8 to 4.0 per 100,000 of the total population.

States with over twice the national average placement rate for large state MR/DD facilities on June 30, 1996 were Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and New Jersey. States with less than one-third the average placement rate for large state MR/DD facilities on June 30, 1996 included Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia. Connecticut, New York, and Rhode Island had the highest placement rates in state-operated community settings of 15 or fewer residents (each over five times the national average). Rhode Island and Connecticut had the highest placement rates in small state-operated settings of 6 or fewer residents (20.4 and 13.9 per 100,000 of the state population, respectively).

Table 1.3 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in State-Operated MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities Per 100,000 of the General Population on June 30, 1996

State	Population (100,000)	State MR/DD Facilities 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Psychiatric Facilities	Total Large (16+)	All State - Operated Facilities
AL	43.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.5	18.5	0.0	18.5	18.5
AK	6.47	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	2.9	0.0	2.9	2.9
AZ	41.45	2.4	2.3	4.7	2.5	7.2	0.0	2.5	7.2
AR	24.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.1	51.1	0.0	51.1	51.1
CA	328.96	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.9	13.9	0.0	13.9	13.9
CO	37.80	0.1	7.8	7.9	5.2	13.1	0.0	5.2	13.1
CT	32.73	13.9	8.7	22.6	36.9	59.5	0.5	37.4	60.0
DE	7.26	0.0	2.1	2.1	40.1	42.1	0.0	40.1	42.1
DC	5.55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FL	144.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.1	10.1	0.0	10.1	10.1
GA	72.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.5	26.5	0.5	26.5	26.5
HI	12.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	3.9	0.0	3.9	3.9
ID	11.83	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.4	10.4	0.0	10.4	10.4
IL	119.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.2	31.2	0.1	31.3	31.3
IN	58.65	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.2	21.2	1.1	22.3	22.3
IA	28.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.4	23.4	6.9	30.2	30.2
KS	26.25	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.8	25.8	0.0	25.8	25.8
KY	38.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.6	16.6	0.0	16.6	16.6
LA	43.83	1.8	0.0	1.8	46.3	48.1	0.0	46.3	48.1
ME	12.37	0.0	3.9	3.9	1.5	5.4	0.0	1.5	5.4
MD	51.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.7	12.7	0.2	12.9	12.9
MA	59.71	4.7	8.2	12.9	30.5	43.4	0.0	30.5	43.4
MI	96.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	0.0	3.6	3.6
MN	46.60	4.8	0.0	4.8	7.4	12.2	0.0	7.4	12.2
MS	26.83	10.1	8.4	18.4	53.1	71.5	0.0	53.1	71.5
MO	53.16	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.1	28.1	0.8	28.9	28.9
MT	8.74	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	18.0	0.0	18.0	18.0
NE	16.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.2	24.2	0.0	24.2	24.2
NV	15.20	0.4	0.8	1.2	10.1	11.3	0.0	10.1	11.3
NH	11.39	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.9
NJ	79.72	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.2	53.2	8.7	53.2	53.2
NM	17.05	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	8.5	0.0	8.5	8.5
NY	181.90	10.6	28.3	38.9	18.7	57.6	0.8	18.7	57.6
NC	72.43	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.7	30.7	0.0	30.7	30.7
ND	6.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.2	23.2	0.0	23.2	23.2
OH	112.53	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.5	18.5	0.0	18.5	18.5
OK	32.93	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8	16.8	0.0	16.8	16.8
OR	31.94	1.2	0.0	1.2	13.4	14.6	0.0	13.4	14.6
PA	121.66	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.0	26.0	0.2	26.2	26.2
RI	10.00	20.4	15.0	35.4	0.0	35.4	0.0	0.0	35.4
SC	37.72	0.6	0.0	0.6	41.0	41.6	0.0	41.0	41.6
SD	7.42	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	34.0	2.2	36.1	36.1
TN	52.90	0.0	0.0	0.0	26.2	26.2	0.0	26.2	26.2
TX	188.81	1.3	0.2	1.5	30.4	31.9	0.0	30.4	31.9
UT	19.85	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.7	15.7	0.0	15.7	15.7
VT	5.82	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
VA	67.26	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.5	32.5	0.0	32.5	32.5
WA	56.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.8	22.8	0.0	22.8	22.8
WV	18.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.1	0.0	4.1	4.1
WI	52.03	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.0	23.0	0.0	23.0	23.0
WY	4.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.4	29.4	0.0	29.4	29.4
U. S. Total	2,659.99	1.5	2.5	4.0	21.9	25.8	0.5	22.4	26.4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Change in Average Daily Population; 1980-1996

Table 1.4 presents summaries of the average daily population of large state MR/DD facilities by state for 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1996 and the percentage of change in average daily population between 1996 and 1980, 1985 and 1990, respectively. The total decrease in populations of large state MR/DD facilities between 1980 and 1996 was 71,152 average daily residents (54.3%). More than half of all states (29) reduced their populations in large state MR/DD facilities by more than 50% during the period. In twelve states the decrease was 80% or more: Arizona, Colorado, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont, and West Virginia.

In the first five years of this period (1980-1985) average daily populations of large state MR/DD facilities decreased by 21,474 (16.4%) or an annual average of about 4,300 residents (or 3.3% per year). In the next five years of this period (1985-1990) large state MR/DD facilities' average daily populations decreased by 25,225 (23.0%) or an annual average of about 5,045 residents (or 4.6% per year). In the six years between 1990 to 1996 the average daily population of large state MR/DD facilities decreased by 24,453 (29.0%) or about 4,076 residents per year. Between 1995 and 1996 the average daily population of large state MR/DD facilities decreased by 3,761. All but 2 states (Arkansas and Georgia) reduced their average daily population of large MR/DD facilities between 1990 and 1996. In 16 states the average daily population decreased by more than 50%.

Movement of Residents in Large State MR/DD Facilities

Table 1.5 presents statistics on the admissions, discharges, and deaths among residents of large state MR/DD facilities during Fiscal Year 1996. Admissions, discharges, and deaths are also indexed as a percentage of the average daily residents of those settings.

Admissions. During Fiscal Year 1996, a total of 2,537 persons with MR/DD were reported admitted to large state MR/DD residential facilities. This number was equal to 4.2% of the year's average daily population of those same settings. Four states with large MR/DD facilities reported no admissions to large state MR/DD residential facilities (Alaska, Delaware, Maine, and New Mexico). Six states reported admissions exceeding 10% of the year's average daily population (Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada and North Dakota).

Discharges. During Fiscal Year 1996 a total of 4,652 persons with MR/DD were reported discharged from large state MR/DD residential facilities. Discharges equaled 7.8% of the average daily population of large state MR/DD residential facilities during the year. Ten states reported discharges equal to 20% or more of their large state MR/DD residential facilities average daily residents (Alabama, Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico and South Dakota). Sixteen states reported discharges of 10% or more of the year's average daily population.

Deaths. During Fiscal Year 1996 a total of 996 people with MR/DD died while residing in large state MR/DD residential facilities. Deaths equaled 1.7% of the average daily population of the large state MR/DD residential facilities. The 1996 death rate of 1.7% was the in the same general range of recent years 1995 (1.7%), 1994 (1.5%), 1993 (1.6%), 1992 (1.4%). Five of the 47 states with large, state-operated MR/DD facilities reported no deaths during the year (Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maine and Nevada). During Fiscal Year 1996 the total deaths in large state MR/DD residential facilities decreased by 72 (6.7%) from Fiscal Year 1995.

Table 1.4 Average Daily Population of Persons with MR/DD Living in Large State MR/DD Facilities by State and Percentage Changes, 1980-1996

State	1980	1985	1990	1996	% Change 1980-1996	% Change 1985-1996	% Change 1990-1996
AL	1,651	1,422	1,305	858	-48.0%	-39.7%	-34.3%
AK	86 e	76	58	24	-72.1%	-68.4%	-58.6%
AZ	672	538	360 e	114	-83.0%	-78.8%	-68.3%
AR	1,550	1,254	1,260	1,275	-17.7%	1.7%	1.2%
CA	8,812	7,524	6,768	4,840	-45.1%	-35.7%	-28.5%
CO	1,353	1,125	466 e	219 e	-83.8%	-80.5%	-53.0%
CT	2,944	2,905	1,799	1,250	-57.5%	-57.0%	-30.5%
DE	518	433	345 e	300	-42.1%	-30.7%	-13.0%
DC	775	351	309 e	0	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%
FL	3,750	2,268	1,992	1,483	-60.5%	-34.6%	-25.6%
GA	2,535	2,097	2,069	2,088	-17.7%	-0.5%	0.9%
HI	432	354	162	67	-84.5%	-81.1%	-58.6%
ID	379	317	210	126	-66.8%	-60.3%	-40.0%
IL	6,067	4,763	4,493	3,781	-37.7%	-20.6%	-15.8%
IN	2,592	2,248	1,940 e	1,219	-53.0%	-45.8%	-37.2%
IA	1,225	1,227	986	687	-43.9%	-44.0%	-30.3%
KS	1,327	1,309	1,017 e	693	-47.8%	-47.1%	-31.9%
KY	907	671	709	665	-26.7%	-0.9%	-6.2%
LA	2,914	3,375	2,622	2,140	-26.6%	-36.6%	-18.4%
ME	460	340	283	52 e	-88.8%	-84.9%	-81.8%
MD	2,527	1,925	1,289	633	-75.0%	-67.1%	-50.9%
MA	4,531	3,580	3,000	1,857	-59.0%	-48.1%	-38.1%
MI	4,888 e	2,191	1,137 e	369 e	-92.5%	-83.2%	-67.5%
MN	2,692	2,065	1,392	415	-84.6%	-79.9%	-70.2%
MS	1,660	1,828	1,498	1,430	-13.9%	-21.8%	-4.5%
MO	2,257	1,856	1,860 e	1,489	-34.0%	-19.8%	-19.9%
MT	316	258	235	154	-51.3%	-40.3%	-34.5%
NE	707	488	466	402	-43.1%	-17.6%	-13.7%
NV	148	172	170	150	1.4%	-12.8%	-11.8%
NH	578	267	87	0	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%
NJ	7,262	5,705	5,069	4,003	-44.9%	-29.8%	-21.0%
NM	500	471	500	185	-63.0%	-60.7%	-63.0%
NY	15,140	13,932	7,694	3,768	-75.1%	-73.0%	-51.0%
NC	3,102	2,947	2,654	2,229	-28.1%	-24.4%	-16.0%
ND	1,056	763	232	147	-86.1%	-80.7%	-36.6%
OH	5,045	3,198	2,665 e	2,108	-58.2%	-34.1%	-20.9%
OK	1,818	1,505	935	543	-70.1%	-63.9%	-41.9%
OR	1,724	1,488	838	433	-74.9%	-70.9%	-48.3%
PA	7,290	5,980	3,986	3,272	-55.1%	-45.3%	-17.9%
RI	681	415	201	0	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%
SC	3,043	2,893 e	2,286	1,576	-48.2%	-45.5%	-31.1%
SD	678	557	391	323	-52.4%	-42.0%	-17.4%
TN	2,074	2,107	1,932	1,495	-27.9%	-29.0%	-22.6%
TX	10,320	9,638	7,320 e	5,845 a	-43.4%	-39.4%	-20.2%
UT	778	706	462	328	-57.8%	-53.5%	-29.0%
VT	331	200	180	0	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%
VA	3,575	3,069	2,650	2,132	-40.4%	-30.5%	-19.5%
WA	2,231	1,844	1,758	1,295	-42.0%	-29.8%	-26.3%
WV	563	498	304 e	80	-85.8%	-83.9%	-73.7%
WI	2,151	2,058 e	1,678 e	1,250	-41.9%	-39.3%	-25.5%
WY	473	413	367	145	-69.3%	-64.9%	-60.5%
U.S. Total	131,088	109,614	84,389	59,936	-54.3%	-45.3%	-29.0%

a indicates information from survey of large Public Residential Facilities

e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1.5 Movement of Persons with MR/DD In and Out of Large State MR/DD Facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 by State

		Admissions		Discharges		Deaths		Residents		
State	Average Daily Population	16+ Total	% Average Daily Population	16+ Total	% Average Daily Population	16+ Total	% Average Daily Population	7/1/95	6/30/96	% Change
AL	858	50	5.8%	177	20.6%	13	1.5%	940	800	-14.9%
AK	24	0	0.0%	8	33.3%	1	4.2%	28	19	-32.1%
AZ	114	1	0.9%	5	4.4%	3	2.6%	123	103	-16.3%
AR	1,275	57	4.5%	35	2.7%	11	0.9%	1,261	1,272	0.9%
CA	4,840	165	3.4%	593	12.3%	89	1.8%	5,098	4,581	-10.1%
CO	219 e	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	241	197	-18.3%
CT	1,250	13	1.0% e	65	5.2% e	26	2.1%	1,290	1,209	-6.3%
DE	300	0	0.0%	18	6.0%	7	2.3%	309	284	-8.1%
DC	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	NA
FL	1,483	78	5.3%	55	3.7%	20	1.3%	1,605	1,459	-9.1%
GA	2,088	175	8.4%	218	10.4%	24	1.1%	1,976	1,909	-3.4%
HI	67	8	11.9%	37	55.2%	0	0.0%	78	49	-37.2%
ID	126	13	10.3%	23	18.3%	0	0.0%	133	123	-7.5%
IL	3,781	262	6.9%	355	9.4%	53	1.4%	3,716	3,718	0.1%
IN	1,219	62	5.1%	86	7.1%	2	0.2%	1,327	1,244	-6.3%
IA	687	50	7.3%	70	10.2%	0	0.0%	692	672	-2.9%
KS	693	8	1.2%	60	8.7%	15	2.2%	732	676	-7.7%
KY	665 e	15	2.3%	25	3.8%	7	1.1%	683	644	-5.7%
LA	2,140	50	2.3%	156	7.3%	36	1.7%	2,173	2,031	-6.5%
ME	52 e	0	0.0% e	42	81.6% e	0	0.0% e	61	19	-68.9%
MD	633	58	9.2%	174	27.5%	7	1.1%	775	652	-15.9%
MA	1,857	17	0.9%	141	7.6%	45	2.4%	1,964	1,824	-7.1%
MI	369	91	24.7%	109	29.5%	6	1.6%	392	346	-11.7%
MN	415	98	23.6%	251	60.5%	5	1.2%	524	345	-34.2%
MS	1,430	100	7.0%	93	6.5%	30	2.1%	1,454	1,424	-2.1%
MO	1,489	111	7.5%	77	5.2%	24	1.6%	1,484	1,494	0.7%
MT	154	11	7.1%	10	6.5%	1	0.6%	157	157	0.0%
NE	402	14	3.5%	23	5.7%	11	2.7%	418	401	-4.1%
NV	150	46	30.7%	34	22.7%	0	0.0%	142	154	8.5%
NH	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NJ	4,003	13	0.3%	8	0.2%	13	0.3%	4,286	4,241	-1.0%
NM	185	0	0.0%	62	33.5%	5	2.7%	210	145	-31.0%
NY	3,768	331	8.8%	197	5.2%	160	4.2%	4,163	3,399	-18.4%
NC	2,229	113	5.1%	166	7.4%	31	1.4%	2,259	2,227	-1.4%
ND	147	16	10.9%	6	4.1%	6	4.1%	144	148	2.8%
OH	2,108	20	0.9%	24	1.1%	40	1.9%	2,131	2,087	-2.1%
OK	543	8	1.5%	40	7.4%	10	1.8%	595	553	-7.1%
OR	433	14	3.2%	22	5.1%	5	1.2%	442	429	-2.9%
PA	3,272	16	0.5%	181	5.5%	63	1.9%	3,392	3,164	-6.7%
RI	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SC	1,576	28	1.8%	13	0.8%	51	3.2%	1,703	1,548	-9.1%
SD	323	15	4.6%	97	30.0%	4	1.2%	338	252	-25.4%
TN	1,495	12	0.8%	210	14.0%	16	1.1%	1,602	1,388	-13.4%
TX	5,845	274	4.7%	313	5.4%	87	1.5%	5,855 e	5,735	-2.0%
UT	328	9	2.7%	42	12.8%	9	2.7%	353	311	-11.9%
VT	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
VA	2,132	87	4.1%	193	9.1%	30	1.4%	2,325	2,189	-5.8%
WA	1,295	16	1.2%	29	2.2%	13	1.0%	1,307	1,281	-2.0%
WV	80	1	1.3%	6	7.5%	5	6.3%	85	75	-11.8%
WI	1,250	9	0.7%	102	8.2%	9	0.7%	1,299	1,197	-7.9%
WY	145	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	3	2.1%	147	145	-1.4%
U.S. Total	59,936	2,537	4.2%	4,652	7.8%	906	1.7%	62,412	58,320	-6.6%

e indicates estimate DNF indicates Data Not Furnished NA indicates Not Applicable

Per Person Expenditures in State-Operated Residential Facilities

Table 1.6 summarizes the expenditures for state-operated MR/DD residential facilities. These expenditures are reported for individual states as an average daily expenditure per resident. The national averages presented are the average daily expenditure per resident reported by each state weighted by that state's average daily resident population. For Fiscal Year 1996, data on the average daily expenditures for large state MR/DD residential facilities were available for all but one state. Four of the 10 states reporting residents with MR/DD in state psychiatric facilities reported daily expenditures for those facilities for Fiscal Year 1996. All states with small state MR/DD facilities, except Colorado, Connecticut and Maine reported an average daily expenditure per resident for those facilities.

Average per resident daily expenditures in large state MR/DD residential facilities varied considerably across the United States with a national average of $252.31. Ten states reported costs in large state MR/DD residential facilities that exceeded $350.00 per day in Fiscal Year 1996 (Alaska, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oregon and West Virginia). Among the 47 states with large state MR/DD residential facilities, 28 reported annual expenditures per resident above the national average of $92,345.46 per person per year. Mississippi reported the lowest average daily expenditure per resident for large state MR/DD residential facilities ($143.70). From Fiscal Year 1995 to 1996 the average daily expenditure per resident of large state MR/DD residential facilities increased 7.4% from $234.96. This was the largest increase in the past 6 years. The previous five years had increases of less than 6%. In the 5 previous years, the per resident expenditures had stabilized in large state MR/DD facilities, due in part to the closure of 83 large state-operated MR/DD residential facilities and special MR/DD units between 1988 and 1995 (an additional 11 closed in FY 1996). Prior to 1988 state expenditure increases for large state-operated MR/DD residential facilities were substantially affected by fewer and fewer residents sharing the fixed costs of a stable number of facilities. Closure and consolidation of large MR/DD facility programs had reduced the effects of these fixed costs in average per resident expenditures. (These closures are described in Chapter 3).

The 4 states providing for persons with MR/DD in state psychiatric facilities for which expenditures were reported had average daily expenditures per resident of $220.06. It should be noted that the reported psychiatric facility expenditures are usually the average daily expenditure per resident for the entire facility, not specifically the expenditures for residents with MR/DD. State psychiatric facility populations have been relatively stable for several years nationwide, so that per resident expenditures have not been driven up as much by the spreading of fixed facility costs over fewer and fewer residents as had been occurring in the large state MR/DD residential facilities.

National average expenditures for state-operated community MR/DD residential facilities were $263.11 per resident per day in settings of 6 or fewer residents and $273.04 in facilities with 7-15 residents. These average rates of expenditure were above that of large state MR/DD residential facilities nationwide, but the difference is related to the states providing small facility services. Of the 11 states reporting both small and large state MR/DD facility expenditures, the average per diem expenditures in large state-operated MR/DD facilities were consistently higher than the average per diem expenditures in the state-operated community facilities.

Table 1.6 Average per Resident Daily Expenditures in State-Operated Facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 by State

State	State MR/DD Facilities					Psychiatric Facilities	
	1-6 Residents		7-15 Residents		16 + Residents		
AL	NA		NA		$251.56	NA	
AK	NA		NA		$452.56	NA	
AZ	$172.79		$231.32		$231.32	NA	
AR	NA		NA		$167.44	NA	
CA	NA		NA		$302.48	NA	
CO	DNF		DNF		$290.17	b	DNF
CT	DNF		DNF		$357.07	e,b	DNF
DE	NA		NA		$263.00	NA	
DC	NA		NA		NA	NA	
FL	NA		NA		$217.00	NA	
GA	NA		NA		DNF	DNF	
HI	NA		NA		$388.00	NA	
ID	NA		NA		$392.07	NA	
IL	NA		NA		$221.30	b	DNF
IN	NA		NA		$237.61	$205.87	
IA	NA		NA		$271.00	b	DNF
KS	NA		NA		$277.44	NA	
KY	NA		NA		$227.00	NA	
LA	$167.00		NA		$191.00	NA	
ME	DNF		$220.00	a	$265.00	NA	
MD	NA		NA		$288.00	NA	
MA	$320.77		$235.19		$424.30	NA	
MI	NA		NA		$383.00	NA	
MN	$305.00		NA		$355.00	NA	
MS	$42.00	e	$130.20		$143.70	NA	
MO	NA		NA		$200.40	$236.00	e
MT	NA		NA		$256.37	NA	
NE	NA		NA		$204.00	*	NA
NV	$221.00		$266.00		$275.00	NA	
NH	$724.00		NA		NA	$548.00	
NJ	NA		NA		$204.20	DNF	
NM	NA		NA		$288.00	NA	
NY	$292.77		$284.04		$355.25	a	DNF
NC	NA		NA		$228.00	NA	
ND	NA		NA		$339.08	NA	
OH	NA		NA		$255.04	NA	
OK	NA		NA		$264.75	NA	
OR	$431.23		NA		$499.30	NA	
PA	NA		NA		$257.00	DNF	
RI	$312.71		$312.71		NA	NA	
SC	$162.60		NA		$192.61	NA	
SD	NA		NA		$214.02	$223.94	
TN	NA		NA		$267.00	NA	
TX	$144.61		$120.53		$182.15	NA	
UT	NA		NA		$230.00	NA	
VT	NA		NA		NA	NA	
VA	NA		NA		$215.43	NA	
WA	NA		NA		$310.16	NA	
WV	NA		NA		$368.16	e	NA
WI	NA		NA		$270.00	NA	
WY	NA		NA		$320.00	NA	
US Weighted Average	$263.11		$273.04		$252.31	$220.06	

a indicates 1995 data b indicates data from survey of individual facilities (See Chapter 3)

DNF indicates Data Not Furnished e indicates estimate NA indicates Not Applicable

* Includes Crisis Intervention Costs

CHAPTER 2
LONGITUDINAL TRENDS IN LARGE STATE-OPERATED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES, 1950-1996

K. Charlie Lakin
Robert W. Prouty
Robert H. Bruininks

This chapter presents a longitudinal view of changing patterns in the placement of persons with MR/DD in state-operated residential facilities with 16 or more residents during the period from 1950 to 1996. Although in recent years there has been substantial development in small state-operated residential facilities, the vast majority (84.7%) of residents of state-operated facilities remain in large facilities (i.e., those with 16 or more residents). As the once overwhelmingly predominant model of residential care (large state MR/DD facilities housed 90.4% of all persons with MR/DD in residential settings in 1967), few statistics have served as better broad indicators of the changing patterns of residential services for persons with MR/DD than the changes taking place in the populations of large state residential facilities.

The longitudinal data presented here are derived from several sources. Data for both state MR/DD and psychiatric facilities for the years 1950 to 1968 are from the National Institute of Mental Health's surveys of "Patients in Institutions". Data on the state mental retardation/developmental disabilities facilities for Fiscal Year 1969 and 1970 come from surveys conducted by the Office on Mental Retardation Coordination, now the Administration on Developmental Disabilities. Data on large state MR/DD facilities for 1971 through 1977 come from the surveys of the National Association of Superintendents of Public Residential Facilities for Persons with Mental Retardation, now the Association of Public Developmental Disabilities Administrators. Data on psychiatric facilities for 1969 to 1977 come from the National Institute of Mental Health's surveys of "Patients in State and County Mental Hospitals". Data on both large state MR/DD and psychiatric facilities for the years 1978 through 1996 come from the ongoing data collection of this project. Data for 1996, the latest survey in this series, are presented in detail in Chapter 1 of this section. The list of "References and Data Sources" includes specific citations for the surveys and statistical summaries used to complete this longitudinal data set. A detailed description of the methodologies used in these surveys can be found in Lakin (1979).

Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities

Table 1.7 reports average daily population of persons with MR/DD in large state MR/DD facilities and psychiatric facilities in selected years, 1950-1996. The gradual depopulation of large state residential facilities for persons with MR/DD has been occurring on a national basis since 1967. Nationally, there has been a decreasing total residential population of large state residential facilities for all types of mental disability (i.e., psychiatric and MR/DD) since 1956. Although the total population in state psychiatric facilities peaked in 1955, the number of persons with a primary diagnosis of mental retardation in state psychiatric facilities continued to increase until 1961. In 1961, there were nearly 42,000 persons with a primary diagnosis of mental retardation in such facilities. The combined total of persons with MR/DD in both large state MR/DD and psychiatric facilities in 1961 was 209,114. By 1967 the number of persons with MR/DD in state psychiatric facilities had decreased to 33,850, but the total number of persons with MR/DD in all large state-operated facilities had increased to 228,500, 194,650 of whom were in large state MR/DD facilities. This was the highest total ever.

Since 1967 the number of persons with MR/DD in all large state residential facilities has decreased to 26.8% of the 1967 total. During this period the numbers of persons with MR/DD in state psychiatric facilities decreased much more rapidly than did the number of persons in large state MR/DD facilities. The different rates of depopulation reflect a number of factors. For one, the depopulation of state psychiatric facilities occurred earlier and more rapidly than the depopulation of state MR/DD facilities. Between 1960 and 1980 the total populations of state psychiatric facilities decreased by about 75% (Zappolo, Lakin & Hill, 1990). This rapid depopulation and frequent closing of facilities has contributed to major reductions in residents with all types of mental disability, including MR/DD. Relatedly over the years, many

large state residential facilities became primarily dedicated to populations with MR/DD or developed independent MR/DD units on the grounds of what were historically public psychiatric facilities.

A driving force in the reduction of residents with MR/DD in state psychiatric facilities has been the general movement toward deinstitutionalization and specific concerns about the appropriateness of placement in psychiatric facilities. It was also important that Medicaid legislation in the late 1960s and early 1970s allowed states to obtain federal cost-sharing of institutional services to persons with MR/DD in Intermediate Care Facilities-Mental Retardation (ICFs-MR) and in nursing homes, but excluded residents of facilities for "mental diseases" from participation in Medicaid, except for children and elderly residents. Distinct units for persons with MR/DD within those facilities could become ICF-MR certified. Many did and those units within the definitions employed in this study are now classified among the large state MR/DD residential facilities.

Figure 1.1 shows the relative contribution of state MR/DD and state psychiatric facilities to the total average daily population of persons with MR/DD in all large state-operated residential facilities. The average daily number of persons with MR/DD in large state MR/DD facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 (59,936) was only 30.8% of the average number in large state MR/DD facilities in 1967, and the total number of persons with MR/DD in all large state residential facilities (61,205) was only 26.8% of the 1967 total.

Residents with MR/DD in large MR/DD facilities accounted for 85.2% of all residents with MR/DD in large state MR/DD and psychiatric facilities in 1967, as compared to 97.9% in 1996.

Table 1.7 Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/ Developmental Disabilities in Large MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities, 1950-1996

Year	MR/DD	Psychiatric	Total
1950	124,304	23,905	148,209
1955	138,831	34,999	173,830
1960	163,730	37,641	201,371
1965	187,305	36,285	224,130
1967	194,650	33,850	228,500
1970	186,743	31,884	218,627
1973	173,775	30,237	204,012
1977	151,532	15,524	167,056
1980	128,058	9,405	137,463
1982	117,160	7,865	125,026
1984	111,333	5,096	116,429
1986	100,190	3,106	103,296
1988	91,582	1,933	93,515
1989	88,691	1,605	90,296
1990	84,732	1,487	86,219
1991	80,269	1,594	81,863
1992	75,151	1,561	76,712
1993	71,477	1,741	73,218
1994	67,673	1,613	69,286
1995	63,697	1,381 e	65,078
1996	59,936	1,269 e	61,205

e indicates estimate

Figure 1.1 Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities, 1950-1996



Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities per 100,000 of the General Population

Since 1967 there has been a substantial decrease in the number of people with MR/DD in large state-operated residential facilities. But as notable as the reduction in total residents, it is even more substantial when adjusted for the growing total population of the United States. Indexing the population of large state facilities by the general population of the U.S. permits a better picture of the relative use of these settings for persons with MR/DD. The average annual placement rates per 100,000 of the total U.S. population for large state MR/DD and psychiatric facilities are shown in Figure 1.2.

The trends in the placement rates of persons with MR/DD in all large state residential facilities are generally similar to trends for the total populations. However, the rate of decrease in the placement rate has been substantially faster because the U.S. population has grown as the population of the large state facilities has decreased. The placement rate of persons with MR/DD in all large state facilities (MR/DD and psychiatric) peaked in 1965 at 115.82 per 100,000 of the general population. This compares with 23.01 in Fiscal Year 1996. The highest placement rate in large state MR/DD facilities was in 1967. That year's placement rate of 98.58 was more than four times greater than the 1996 rate of 22.53.

As noted earlier, some of the decrease in the placement rate in large state psychiatric facilities between 1973 and 1996 reflects changing definitions. During that period some settings historically serving psychiatric populations either through official or operational designation became facilities primarily serving persons with MR/DD. Others developed specific administratively distinct MR/DD units within traditional psychiatric facilities. But by far the most important factors in the decreasing numbers of persons with MR/DD in psychiatric facilities have been the major changes in philosophy and federal sharing of the costs of care for persons living in large MR/DD facilities certified to participate in the Intermediate Care Facility for Persons with Mental Retardation (ICF-MR) program (245 of 252 large state MR/DD facilities nationwide). The statistics in Figure 1.2 show clearly a substantial decrease in the rate of placement of persons with MR/DD in state-operated residential facilities. The placement rate in 1996 for all large state facilities (23.01) was only 19.9% of the 1965 placement rate (115.8).

Table 1.8 Average Daily Population of Persons with Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities per 100,000 of the General Population, 1950-1996

Year	U.S. Population in 100,000's	MR/DD	Psychiatric	Total
1950	1,518.68	81.85	15.75	97.59
1955	1,650.69	84.10	21.20	105.30
1960	1,799.79	90.97	20.91	111.88
1965	1,935.26	96.79	19.03	115.82
1967	1,974.57	98.58	17.14	115.72
1970	2,039.84	91.55	15.63	107.18
1973	2,113.57	82.22	14.31	96.53
1980	2,272.36	56.35	4.14	60.49
1984	2,361.58	47.14	2.16	49.30
1986	2,387.70	41.96	1.30	43.26
1989	2,482.43	35.73	0.65	36.38
1990	2,487.09	34.07	0.58	34.65
1991	2,521.77	31.83	0.63	32.46
1992	2,540.02	29.58	0.61	30.20
1993	2,559.50	27.93	0.68	28.61
1994	2,579.04	26.24	0.63	26.87
1995	2,634.37	24.18	0.52	24.70
1996	2,659.99	22.53	0.48	23.01

Figure 1.2
Average Daily Population of Persons with MR/DD in Large State MR/DD and Psychiatric Facilities per 100,000 of the General Population on June 30 of Years Indicated



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Movement Patterns in Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities

From the beginning of this century until the mid-1960's, resident movement statistics of large state MR/DD residential facilities indicated relatively stable movement patterns. During that period first admissions and discharges both steadily increased, but populations of large state MR/DD facilities grew as first admissions substantially outnumbered discharges. During this same period readmissions remained relatively low because once placed in a state facility, people tended to remain there. From 1903 to 1965 the annual number of deaths in large state MR/DD facilities increased substantially, but death rates (deaths as a percentage of average daily population) decreased steadily from 4.1% to 1.9%.

By the mid-1960s these historical patterns began to change. In 1965 the number of first admissions to large state MR/DD facilities began to decrease, dropping below the increasing number of discharges by 1968. The number of readmissions increased substantially throughout the 1970s as return to the facility was a frequently used solution to problems in community placements. From 1980 to 1996, readmissions were reduced fairly steadily, but remained a substantial proportion of total admissions (35.7% in 1991, 30.7% in 1994 and 31.8% in 1996). Over this same period total admissions (first admissions and readmissions) generally remained fairly consistently between 2,000 and 3,000 fewer than the number of discharges. Distinctions are no longer being made in this state survey for new admissions and readmissions, because the increasing rates of large state MR/DD facility closures, consolidations, and resident transfers have made such distinctions less easily obtained from state reporting systems. (Statistics on patterns of new admissions and readmissions based on the reports of individual large state MR/DD facilities from 1985 to 1996 are provided in Chapter 4.) Table 1.9 and Figure 1.3 show that between Fiscal Year 1995 and Fiscal Year 1996 overall admissions to large state MR/DD facilities actually increased 8.5% from 2,338 to 2,537 persons. This was the second year of an increase. Between Fiscal Year 1994 and Fiscal Year 1995 admissions increased 4.2%.

In recent years, the number of discharges has fallen far below the numbers apparent in the first 12 years of large state MR/DD facility depopulation (i.e., until 1980). The period of the greatest number of discharges was the decade of the 1970s when discharges were consistently between 14,000 and 17,000 per year. In the eight year period including fiscal years 1989 through 1996 discharges have remained in a range between 4,652 and 6,877 per year. In 1996 there were 4,652 total discharges.

Deinstitutionalization literally connotes a process of discharging people from large residential facilities, but Figure 1.3 shows clearly that it has also encompassed important successes in reducing placements in such facilities. The resident movement patterns shown in Figure 1.3 indicate that this latter "preventative" policy (i.e., reducing admissions to large state MR/DD facilities) has actually accounted for relatively more of the reduction in large state MR/DD facility populations over the past two decades than has the number of discharges, although both clearly have played important roles. As shown in Figure 1.3 there had been a generally steady decrease in both admissions and discharges over the past two decades however, since 1994 admissions have increased slightly after two decades of decreases. Total deaths reported for 1996 decreased slightly from 1995. In 1996 the number of deaths as a percentage of average daily residents was 1.66% as compared with 1.68% in 1995, 1.47% in 1994 and 1.63% in 1993.

Table 1.9 Movement Patterns in Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996

Year	Admissions	Discharges	Deaths
1950	12,197	6,672	2,761
1955	13,906	5,845	2,698
1960	14,182	6,451	3,133
1965	17,225	9,358	3,585
1967	14,904	11,665	3,635
1970	14,979	14,702	3,496
1974	18,075	16,807	2,913
1978	10,508	15,412	2,154
1980	11,141	13,622	2,019
1984	6,123	8,484	1,555
1986	6,535	9,399	1,322
1989	5,337	6,122	1,180
1990	5,034	6,877	1,207
1991	3,654	5,541	1,077
1992	4,349	6,316	1,075
1993	2,947	5,536	1,167
1994	2,243	5,490	995
1995	2,338	5,337	1,068
1996	2,537	4,652	996

Figure 1.3 Movement Patterns in Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996



Annual Per Resident Expenditures in Large State-Operated MR/DD Facilities

The per person expenditures for people with MR/DD living in large state-operated MR/DD facilities have increased dramatically since 1950, when the average per person annual expenditures for care was $745.60 per person per year. Even in dollars adjusted for changes in the Consumer Price Index over this period, expenditures for care in 1996 ($92,345.46 per year) were about 19 times as great as in 1950. Figure 1.4 shows the trends in large state MR/DD facility expenditures in both actual and adjusted dollars ($1=1983) between 1950 and 1996. In terms of 1983 "real dollar" equivalents, the average annual per person expenditures for care in large state MR/DD facilities increased from just over $3,000 to over $58,000 during the 45 year period. That rate of increase represents an annual, after inflation, compounded growth of 10% per person per year. However, in the last five years, the rate increases have slowed substantially. Between Fiscal Year 1990 and 1996 states reported a 5.8% real dollar increase in large state MR/DD facility expenditures. This compares to an average real dollar increase of 8.8% per year during the 1980's. A major factor in controlling large state MR/DD facility expenditures has been the large number of recent facility closures described in Chapter 3 of this report. Prior to this period, a number of factors had been contributing to the steady increases in the large state MR/DD facility expenditures. One contributing factor has been the continuing increase in the proportion of persons with severe impairments in their resident populations. As one indicator of this, in 1940 about 65% of all residents of large state MR/DD facilities had borderline, mild, or moderate retardation and 16% had an equivalent of profound mental retardation. In 1964, 40% of residents were classified as having borderline, mild or moderate mental retardation and 27% as having profound mental retardation. By 1996, the proportion of persons with borderline, mild or moderate mental retardation had decreased to 16.3%, while the proportion of persons with profound mental retardation had increased to 65.9%. Associated with these changes have been increased staff to resident ratios and increased numbers of professional staff employed to serve remaining residents.

Two major factors began to exercise considerable upward pressure on expenditures in the early 1970's. The first of these was the Intermediate Care Facility for Persons with Mental Retardation (ICF-MR) program enacted in 1971 (described in Section III). This program offers Federal cost-sharing through Medicaid of 50-80% of the expenditures for residential and "active treatment" services, depending on the per capita income in states, under the condition that facilities meet specific program, staffing, and physical plant standards. In 1996, 19 of every 20 large state MR/DD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

facility residents lived in units with ICF-MR certification. The ICF-MR program has significantly cushioned the impact of rapidly increasing large MR/DD facility costs for the states. For example, in 1970, one year before enactment of the ICF-MR program, the average annual per resident real dollar ($1=1983) expenditure in large state MR/DD facilities was about $12,000. In 1996, the average annual per resident real dollar cost was $ 58,225.96. Over that period state large MR/DD residential facility real dollar expenditures grew by 3.87 times, but the states' share of the increased real dollar expenditures for state institution care "only" doubled because of the new federal ICF-MR cost-sharing that began in 1971. Court decisions and settlement agreements have also had significant impact on expenditures with their frequent requirements for upgrading staffing levels, adding programs, improving physical environments, and frequently, reducing resident populations.

From the late 1960's until the late 1980's, the steady decrease in large state MR/DD facility populations with neither reductions in facility budgets nor substantially reduced number of facilities led to steady increases in per resident expenditures. As more and more former large state MR/DD facility residents moved to community residential arrangements, the fixed costs of underutilized physical plants and specialized professional staff played a major role in pushing up the per resident expenditures. The greatly increased number of closures of state MR/DD facilities in the second half of the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s has played an important role in the remarkably reduced rate of growth of state MR/DD facility expenditures in recent years.

Table 1.10 Average Annual Per Resident Expenditures for Care in Large State-Operated MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996

Year	Cost	Cost ($1=1983)
1950	$745.60	$3,094.99
1955	$1,285.50	$4,797.49
1960	$1,867.70	$6,299.75
1965	$2,361.08	$7,475.18
1967	$2,965.33	$8,875.23
1970	$4,634.85	$11,930.10
1974	$9,937.50	$20,163.19
1977	$16,143.95	$26,621.31
1980	$24,944.10	$30,307.08
1982	$32,758.75	$33,905.31
1984	$40,821.60	$39,229.56
1986	$47,555.85	$43,418.49
1988	$57,221.05	$48,409.01
1989	$67,200.15	$54,230.52
1990	$71,660.45	$54,891.90
1991	$75,051.30	$55,087.65
1992	$76,945.65	$54,862.25
1993	$81,453.40	$56,365.71
1994	$82,256.40	$55,523.07
1995	$85,760.40	$56,273.23
1996	$92,345.46	$58,225.38

Figure 1.4
Average Annual Per Resident Expenditures
in Large State-Operated MR/DD Residential Facilities, 1950-1996



CHAPTER 3
LARGE STATE MR/DD RESIDENTIAL FACILITY CLOSURES, 1960-2000 AND INDIVIDUAL FACILITY POPULATIONS AND PER DIEM RATES IN FISCAL YEAR 1996

Jennifer Sandlin
Robert Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin

This chapter summarizes information gathered from each of the states on large state MR/DD facilities and special MR/DD units in psychiatric facilities that have operated since 1960 and their present and projected operational status. Responses were obtained from all states.

Total Large State MR/DD Facility Closures

Figure 1.5 shows the number of large state MR/DD facilities and MR/DD units in large state facilities primarily serving other populations that have closed since 1960, including closures for the period 1997 to 2000 that were being planned as of late Fall 1996. As shown between 1960 and 1971 only two large state MR/DD facilities were closed in the United States, an average of 0.17 per year. In Fiscal Years 1972-1975 there were a total of five closures, an average of 1.25 per year. There were 5 large state MR/DD facility closures in the period Fiscal Years 1976-1979 (an annual average of 1.25 per year). There were 14 in the period Fiscal Years 1980-1983 (annual average of 3.5 per year) and 11 in the period Fiscal Years 1984-1987 (annual average of 3.0).In the period Fiscal Years 1988-1991, closures increased rapidly to 34 (an average of 8.5 per year). In the Fiscal Years 1992-1996, closures averaged 12 per year to a total of 60. In the Fiscal Years 1997-2000 states currently project closures of a total of 21 large state MR/DD facilities and MR/DD units in other large state facilities (an average of 5.25 per year). This would represent a substantial decline in the rate of actual closures established between 1988 and 1996, but as in past years, the number of closures that will actually occur between 1997 and 2000 will likely significantly surpass the number projected at the beginning of that 4 year period. Four states (District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont) no longer have large state-operated MR/DD residential facilities. A number of states are currently developing plans for total or very significant reductions in the number of large state operated MR/DD residential facilities. For example, Alaska, Hawaii, and West Virginia each of which still operate one state institution, anticipate operating no state facilities of 16 or more residents by the end of the century. Michigan, which had already closed 10 of 13 large state facilities by 1995, projects at least one more closure by the end of the century. New York which had already closed nearly half of its large state facilities by 1995, has planned closing two more of its remaining 11 traditional state institutions by the year 2000. Pennsylvania having already closed 12 of 23 large state residential facilities will close 3 more by 2000, and Minnesota which has closed four of its nine institutions anticipates closure of four of five remaining by the year 2000.

Figure 1.5
Average Annual Number of Large State MR/DD Facilities Closed and Planned for Closure, 1960 - 2000



Closures and Projected Closures by States

Table 1.11 presents a state-by-state breakdown of the total number of large state facilities and MR/DD units operated since 1960, the number closed between 1960 and 1995, and the number planned for closure by the year 2000. As shown, about 75% of the states (38) have either closed a large state MR/DD facility or are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

planning to do so by the end of 2000. In the 36 year period from 1960 through 1996, 36 states closed one or more facilities. Fifteen states plan to close at least one large state MR/DD facility between 1997 and 2000. Only two of the states (Alaska and Tennessee) planning large facility closures between 1997 and 2000 have not previously closed a large state MR/DD facility or unit. Overall, 21 of 216 remaining (9.3%) large state-operated MR/DD residential facilities are currently projected for closure in Fiscal Years 1997-2000.

Large State MR/DD Residential Facilities Operating and Closing, 1960-2000

Table 1.12 presents a list of all the large state MR/DD facilities and units that have operated in each state since 1960. It provides the year of opening of each facility and the last year of operation of facilities and units that have closed. For large state facilities that are still in operation it is indicated whether there are currently plans for the facility to be closed by the end of the year 2000. Of course, the stability of such plans, either for closure and increasingly about remaining in operation, are by no means guaranteed.

Individual Large State Facility Populations and Per Diem Rates

Table 1.12 also provides summary statistics on the populations and per diem rates as reported by 216 large state-operated residential facilities that remained open to serve persons with MR/DD on June 30, 1996. The total number of residents with MR/DD in individual large state facilities on June, 30 1996 ranged from a high of 1,032 residents in California's Sonoma Developmental Center to 20 or fewer residents in 6 state facilities.

The reported per diem rates ranged from $900 to $130.00. Some variations can be noted in their facility statistics and the aggregated, state-reported statistics in Table 1.6. The differences derive from variations in accounting for all state versus individual facility expenditures, including variations in the absorption of state agency administrative expenditures into the rates reported by the states, exclusion of costs of some off-campus services in the individual facility rates, and other variations in cost accounting.

Table 1.11Summary of Large State-Operated MR/DD Residential Facilities and Units since 1960, including Closures and Planned Closures

State	Large State-Operated MR/DD Residential Facilities operating between 1960 and 1996	Total Closed 1960-1996	Planned Closures 1997-2000
AL	5	1	0
AK	1	0	1
AZ	4	3	0
AR	6	0	0
CA	11	4	1
CO	3	1	0
CT	15	6	1
DE	1	0	0
DC	3	3	0
FL	10	2	0
GA	8	1	0
HI	2	1	1
ID	1	0	0
IL	17	6	1
IN	11	4	0
IA	2	0	0
KS	4	1	1
KY	5	2	0
LA	9	0	0
ME	3	2	0
MD	9	5	0
MA	11	4	1
MI	13	10	1
MN	9	4	4
MS	5	0	0
MO	16	10	0
MT	2	0	0
NE	1	0	0
NV	2	0	0
NH	2	2	0
NJ	11	3	1
NM	3	2	1
NY	27*	13	2
NC	6	1	0
ND	2	1	0
OH	23	11	0
OK	4	1	0
OR	3	1	0
PA	23	12	3
RI	3	3	0
SC	5	0	0
SD	2	1	0
TN	5	0	1
TX	15	2	0
UT	1	0	0
VT	1	1	0
VA	8	3	0
WA	6	1	0
WV	4	3	1
WI	3	0	0
WY	1	0	0
U.S. Total	347	131	21

* includes only the Development Centers operated by New York State Office of Mental Retardation and Developmentla Disabilities

Table 1.12: Large State MR/DD Facility Closures, 1960-2000, and Individual Facility Populations and Per Diem Expenditures in FY 1996

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
AL	Albert P. Brewer Ctr. (Mobile)	1973	NO	178	178	178	312.64
	Glen Ireland II Ctr. (Tarrant City)	1986	1996	70	70	80	300.18
	Wm. D. Partlow Ctr. (Tuscaloosa)	1923	NO	247	247	265	231.38
	J.S. Tarwater Ctr. (Wetumpka)	1976	NO	79	79	94	254.28
	Lurlene B. Wallace Ctr. (Decatur)	1971	NO	224	224	228	203.03
AK	Harborview Ctr. (Valdez)	1967	1997	19	24	19	434.00
AZ	Arizona Trng. Program (Phoenix)	1973	1988				
	Arizona Trng. Program (Tucson)	1970	1995				
	Arizona Trng. Program (Coolidge)	1952	NO	149	149	146	252.50
	Arizona State Hosp. (Phoenix)	1978e	1994				
AR	Alexander Ctr. (Alexander)	1968	NO	132	132	130	172.00
	Arkadelphia Ctr. (Arkadelphia)	1968	NO	151	151	151	173.00
	Booneville Ctr. (Booneville)	1973	NO	171	171	168	166.00
	Conway Ctr. (Conway)	1959	NO	615	615	616	182.00
	Jonesboro Ctr. (Jonesboro)	1970	NO	124	124	125	152.22
	Southeast Arkansas Ctr. (Warren)	1978	NO	78	78	77	196.00
CA	Agnews Ctr. (San Jose)	1966	NO	642	642	672	355.36
	Camarillo Ctr. (Camarillo)	1968	1997	471	471	461	312.39
	DeWitt State Hosp. (Auburn)	1946	1972				
	Fairview Ctr. (Costa Mesa)	1959	NO	766	766	825	262.84
	Lanterman Ctr. (Pomona)	1927	NO	766	766	804	340.00
	Modesto State Hosp. (Modesto)	1947	1962				
	Napa State Hosp. (Napa)[1]	1995	NO	157	157	152	300.00
	Patton State Hosp. (Patton)	1963	1982				
	Porterville Ctr. (Porterville)	1953	NO	729	729	739	278.11
	Sonoma Ctr. (Eldridge)	1891	NO	1,032	1,032	1,079	279.36
	Stockton Ctr. (Stockton)	1972	1996				
CO	Grand Junction Regional Ctr. (Grand Junction)	1919	NO	161	161	171	278.28

[1]Napa State Hospital (CA) began serving persons with MR/DD in 1969 and closed for MR/DD residents in 1987. In 1995, a special MR/DD unit was reopened.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
CO cont.	Pueblo State Regional Ctr. (Pueblo)	1935	1988				
	Wheat Ridge Regional Ctr. (Wheatridge)	1912	NO	30	30	30	369.84
CT	Bridgeport Ctr. (Bridgeport)	1965	1981				
	Clifford Street Group Home (Hartford)	1982	1995				
	John Dempsey Ctr. (Putnam)[2]	1964	1997	17	17	17	476.13
	Ella Grasso Ctr. (Stratford)	1981	NO	68	68	68	430.00
	Hartford Ctr. (Newington)	1965	NO	76	76	76	433.95
	Lower Fairfield County Ctr. (Norwalk)	1976	NO	72	72	72	430.00e
	Mansfield Trng. School (Mansfield)	1917	1993				
	Martin House Group Home (Norwalk)	1971	NO	16	16	16	DNF
	Meridan Ctr. (Wallingford)	1979	NO	25	25	25	490.00
	Mystic Ctr. (Groton)	1979	NO	41	41	41	519.81
	New Haven Ctr. (New Haven)	1962	1994				
	Northwest Ctr. (Torrington)	1984	NO	47	47	45	543.62
	Seaside Ctr. (Waterford)	1961	1996	17	17	17	445.63
	Southbury Trng. School (Southbury)	1940	NO	809	809	823	310.93e
	Waterbury Ctr. (Cheshire)	1971	1989				
DE	Stockley Ctr. (Georgetown)	1921	NO	291	291	300	263.78
DC	Bureau of Forest Haven (Laurel, MD)	1925	1990				
	St. Elizabeth's Hosp. (Washington, DC)	1987	1994				
	D.C. Village (Washington, DC)	1975	1994				
FL	FL State Hosp: 1) MR Defendant Program; 2) Unit 27 (Dually Diagnosed) (Chattahoochee)	1) 1977 2) 1976	1) NO 2) NO	71 30	71 30	71 30	150.25 205.00
	Gulf Coast Ctr. (Fort Meyers)	1960	NO	330	332	331	199.40
	Landmark Learning Ctr. (Opa-Locka)	1966	NO	255	255	255	259.40
	N.E. Florida State Hosp. (MacClenny)	1981	NO	24	524	24	200.00
	Seguin Unit-Alachua Retarded Defendant Ctr. (Gainesville)	1989	NO	23	23	23	226.33
	Sunland at Marianna (Marianna)	1961	NO	342	342	343	230.16

[2] John Dempsey (CT) converted 1 of its 2 cottages to a non-residential, multi-purpose Family Resource Center and will downsize resident population in its other cottage to 10 persons, with 3 additional respite beds, in 1997.

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
FL cont.	Sunland Trng. Ctr. (Orlando)	1960	1984				
	Sunland Trng. Ctr. (Tallahassee)	1968	1983				
	Tacachale (Formerly Sunland at Gainesville)	1921	NO	540	540	553	191.45
GA	Brook Run (Atlanta)	1969	NO	318	318	316	256.00
	Central State Hosp. (Milledgeville)	1965	NO	572	1,306	573	198.34
	Georgia Regional Hosp. at Atlanta (Decatur)	1968	NO	41	41	41	223.00
	Gracewood State School and Hosp. (Gracewood)	1921	NO	620	620	623e	DNF
	Northwest Regional Hosp. (Rome)	1971	NO	97e	97e	97e	223.00
	River's Crossing (Athens)	DNF	1996				
	Rose Haven (Thomasville)	1968	NO	109	109	109	249.00
	Southwestern Ctr. (Bainbridge)	1967	NO	155	155	162	249.00
HI	Waimano Trng. School and Hosp. (Pearl City)	1921	1998	49	49	57	388.00
	Kula Hosp. (Kula)	1984	1994				
ID	Idaho State School and Hosp. (Nampa)	1918	NO	121	121	127	385.00
IL	Alton Mental Health & Dev Ctr. (Alton)	1914	1994				
	Bowen Ctr. (Harrisburg)	1966	1982				
	Choate Mental Health and Ctr. (Anna)	1873	NO	229	321	244	207.99
	Dixon Ctr. (Dixon)	1918	1987				
	Elgin Mental Health & Ctr. (Elgin)	1872	1994				
	Fox Ctr. (Dwight)	1965	NO	171	171	173	172.36
	Galesburg Ctr. (Galesburg)	1959	1985				
	Howe Ctr. (Tinley Park)	1973	NO	388	388	389	262.00
	Jacksonville Ctr. (Jacksonville)	1851	NO	310	310	309	216.00
	Kiley Ctr. (Waukegan)	1975	2000	396	396	409	222.00
	Lincoln Ctr. (Lincoln)	1866	NO	447	467	446	251.00
	Ludeman Ctr. (Park Forest)	1972	NO	455e	455e	461e	243.34
	Mabley Ctr. (Dixon)	1987	NO	112	112	111	170.39
	Meyer Mental Health Ctr. (Decatur)[3]	1967	1993				
	Murray Ctr. (Centralia)	1964	NO	351	351	352	260.00
	Shapiro Ctr. (Kankakee)	1879	NO	757	767	757	179.47

[3] Meyer (IL) closed for persons with developmental disabilities, now called the Meyer Mental Health Center.

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
IL cont.	Singer Mental Health & Ctr. (Rockford)	1966	NO	52	137	53	261.93
IN	Central State Hosp. (Indianapolis)	1848	1995				
	Evansville State Hosp. (Evansville)	1890	NO	57	272	56	204.38
	Fort Wayne Ctr. (Fort Wayne)	1890	NO	466	466	454	217.07
	Logansport State Hosp. (Logansport)	1888	NO	48	369	49	220.00
	Madison State Hosp. (Madison)	1910	NO	44	317	40	195.00
	Muscatatuck Ctr. (Butlerville)	1920	NO	411	411	415	278.30
	New Castle Ctr. (New Castle)	1907	NO	158	158	163	253.41
	Norman Beatty Memorial Hosp. (Westville)	1951	1979				
	Northern Indiana Ctr. (South Bend)	1961	NO	56	56	54	335.00
	Richmond State Hosp. (Richmond)	1890	1996				
	Silvercrest State Hosp. (New Albany)	1974	1995				
IA	Glenwood State Hosp. and School (Glenwood)	1917	NO	403	403	409	256.71
	Woodward State Hosp. and School (Woodward)	1876	NO	280	280	278	292.02
KS	Kansas Neurological Institute (Topeka)	1960	NO	232	232	240	281.00
	Norton State Hosp. (Norton)	1963	1988				
	Parsons State Hosp. and Trng. Ctr. (Parsons)	1952	NO	238	238	222	232.47
	Winfield State Hosp. (Winfield)	1884	1998	226e	226	235e	299.70
KY	Central State Hosp. ICF/MR (Louisville)	1873	NO	42	42	42	365.00
	Frankfort State Hosp. and School (Frankfort)	1860	1973				
	Hazelwood Ctr. (Louisville)	1971	NO	190	190	205	225.00
	Oakwood ICF/MR (Somerset)	1972	NO	412	412	418	155.74
	Outwood ICF/MR (Dawson Springs)	1962	1994				
LA	Columbia Ctr. (Columbia)	1970	NO	25	25	25	146.36
	Hammond Ctr. (Hammond)	1964	NO	388	414	399	205.14
	Leesville Ctr. (Leesville)	1964	NO	20	20	19	220.03
	Metropolitan Ctr. (Belle Chase)	1967	NO	260	260	261	229.00
	Northwest Louisiana Ctr. (Bossier City)	1973	NO	181	181	190	211.32
	Peltier-Lawless Ctr. (Thibodaux)	1982	NO	44	44	43	232.32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
LA cont.	Pinecrest Ctr. (Pineville)	1918	NO	846	846	889	186.84
	Ruston Ctr. (Ruston)	1959	NO	108	108	110	160.93
	Southwest Louisiana Ctr. (Iota)	1972	NO	100	100	100	180.79
ME	Aroostook Residential Ctr. (Presque Isle)[4]	1972	1995				
	Elizabeth Levinson Ctr. (Bangor)	1971	NO	19	19	19	265.00e
	Pineland Ctr. (Pownal)	1908	1995				
MD	Joseph Brandenberg Ctr. (Cumberland)	1978	NO	53	53	53	215.00
	Victor Cullen Ctr. (Sabillasville)	1974	1992				
	Great Oaks Ctr. (Silver Springs)	1970	1996				
	Henryton Ctr. (Henryton)	1962	1985				
	Highland Health Facility (Baltimore)	1972	1989				
	Holly Ctr. (Salisbury)	1975	NO	190	190	183	DNF
	Potomac Ctr. (Hagerstown)	1978	DNF	119e	119	119	190.04
	Rosewood Ctr. (Owings Mills)	1887	NO	283	283	277	345.19
	Walter P. Carter Ctr. (Baltimore)	1978	1990				
MA	Belchertown State School (Belchertown)	1922	1992				
	Paul A. Dever State School (Taunton)	1946	1998	148	148	165	495.38
	Walter E. Fernald State School (Waltham)	1848	NO	392	392	450e	348.07e
	Glavin Regional Ctr. (Shrewsbury)	1974	NO	63	63	63	255.53
	Hogan Regional Ctr. (Hathorne)	1967	NO	203	203	207	305.84
	Berry Regional Ctr. (Hathorne)	1967	1994				
	Medfield State Hosp. (Medfield)	DNF	1994				
	Monson Ctr. (Palmer)	1898	NO	343	343	377	401.96
	Templeton Ctr. (Baldwinsville)	DNF	NO	184	184	184	293.00
	Worcester State Hosp. (Worcester)	DNF	1994				
	Wrentham State School (Wrentham)	1907	NO	432	432	440	457.05

[4] Downsized to 12 persons with MR/DD.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
MI	Alpine Regional Ctr. for DD (Gaylord)	1960	1981				
	Caro Regional Mental Health Ctr. (Caro)	1914	NO	96	167	98	370.26
	Coldwater Regional Ctr. for DD (Coldwater)	1935	1987				
	Fort Custer State Home (Augusta)	1956	1972				
	Hillcrest Regional Ctr. for DD (Howell)	1959	1982				
	Macomb-Oakland Regional Ctr. for DD (Mt. Clemens)	1967	1989				
	Mount Pleasant Regional Ctr. for DD (Mount Pleasant)	1937	2000	155	155	161	365.93
	Muskegon Regional Ctr. for DD (Muskegon)	1969	1992				
	Newberry Regional Mental Health Ctr. (Newberry)	1895	1992				
	Northville Residential Trng. Ctr. (Northville)	1972	1983				
	Oakdale Regional Ctr. for DD (Lapeer)	1895	1992				
	Plymouth Ctr. for Human Development (Northville)	1960	1984				
	Southgate Regional Ctr. (Southgate)	1977	NO	103	103	116	405.00
MN	Brainerd Regional Human Services Ctr. (Brainerd)	1958	1999	59	59	64	DNF
	Cambridge Regional Human Services Ctr. (Cambridge)	1925	NO	86	86	109	364.00
	Fairbault Regional Ctr. (Fairbault)	1879	1998	98	98	126	368.00
	Fergus Falls Regional Treatment Ctr. (Fergus Falls)	1969	2000	79	235	81	355.00
	Moose Lake Regional Treatment Ctr. (Moose Lake)	1970	1994				
	Owatonna State School (Owatonna)	1945	1972				
	Rochester State Hosp. (Rochester)	1968	1982				
	St. Peter Regional Treatment Ctr. (St. Peter)	1968	1997	22	394	34	355.00
	Willmar Regional Treatment Ctr. (Willmar)	1973	1996				
MS	Boswell Regional Ctr. (Sanatorium)	1976	NO	180	180	180	130.00e
	Ellisville State School (Ellisville)	1920	NO	531	531	545	161.67

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
MS cont.	Hudspeth Regional Ctr. (Whitfield)	1974	NO	275	275	275	154.63
	North Mississippi Regional Ctr. (Oxford)	1973	NO	274	274	263	139.52
	South Mississippi Regional Ctr. (Long Beach)	1978	NO	158	200	200	178.92
MO	Albany Regional Ctr. (Albany)	1967	1991				
	Bellefontaine Habilitation Ctr. (St. Louis)	1924	NO	365	367	373	181.38
	Hannibal Regional Ctr. (Hannibal)	1967	1989				
	Higginsville Habilitation Ctr. (Higginsville)	1956	NO	156	156	156	375.98
	Joplin Regional Ctr. (Joplin)	1967	1992				
	Kansas City Regional Ctr. (Kansas City)	1970	1993				
	Kirksville Regional Ctr. (Kirksville)	1968	1988				
	Marshall Habilitation Ctr. (Marshall)	1901	NO	354	354	350	198.54
	Marshall Regional Ctr. (Marshall)	1975	1982				
	Nevada Habilitation Ctr. (Nevada)	1973	NO	147	147	145	184.33
	Poplar Bluff Regional Ctr. (Poplar Bluff)	1968	1992				
	Rolla Regional Ctr. (Rolla)	1968	1984				
	Sikeston Regional Ctr. (Sikeston)	1969	1992				
	Southeast Missouri Residential Services (Poplar Bluff, Sikeston)[5]	1992	NO	92	92	94	194.52
	Springfield Regional Ctr. (Springfield)	1967	1990				
	St. Louis DD Treatment Ctr. (St. Louis)	1974	NO	318e	318	316e	185.30e
MT	Montana Ctr. (Boulder)	1905	NO	107	107	107	285.06
	Eastmont Human Services Ctr. (Glendive)	1969	NO	50	50	50	200.00
NE	Beatrice State Ctr. (Beatrice)	1875	NO	407	407	415	204.00
NV	Desert Ctr. (Las Vegas)	1975	NO	94	94	95	260.05
	Sierra Ctr. (Reno)	1977	NO	67	67	63	310.00

[5] Merger of Poplar Bluff and Sikeston Regional Centers.

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
NH	Laconia State School and Trng. Ctr. (Laconia)	1903	1991				
	New Hampshire Hosp., Brown Building (Concord)	1842	1990				
NJ	Ctr. at Ancora (Hammonton)	DNF	1992				
	Edison Habilitation Ctr. (Princeton)	1975	1988				
	E.R. Johnstone Trng. & Research Ctr (Bordentown)	1955	1992				
	Green Brook Regional Ctr. (Green Brook)	1981	NO	118	118	118	222.00
	Hunterdon Ctr. (Clinton)	1969	NO	637	637	645	328.68
	New Lisbon Ctr. (New Lisbon)	1914	NO	714	714	710	359.64
	North Jersey Ctr. (Totowa)	1928	NO	447	447	446	217.88
	North Princeton Ctr. (Princeton)	1975	1998	493	493	507	300.00
	Vineland Ctr. (Vineland)	1888	NO	643	643	654	333.44
	Woodbine Ctr. (Woodbine)	1921	NO	588	588	588	215.00
	Woodbridge Ctr. (Woodbridge)	1965	NO	615	615	612	182.14
NM	Fort Stanton Hosp. and Trng. Ctr. (Fort Stanton)	1964	1995				
	Los Lunas Hosp. and Trng. Ctr. (Los Lunas)	1929	1997	140	140	185	345.27
	Villa Solano-Hagerman Residential School (Roswell)	1964	1982				
NY	J.N. Adams DDSO (Perrysburg)	1960	1993				
	Bronx DDSO (Bronx)	1971	1992				
	Brooklyn DDSO (Brooklyn)	1972	NO	291	291	285	252.00
	Broome DDSO (Binghamton)	1970	NO	338	353	361	183.66
	Bernard M. Fineson DDSO (Corona)	1970	NO	113	113	110	141.26
	Craig DDSO (Sonyea)	1935	1988				
	Creekside (Nunda)	1987	NO	24	24	24	900.00[6]
	Gouverneur (New York)	1962	1978				
	Oswald D. Heck DDSO (Schenectady)	1973	NO	135	135	135	DNF
	Letchworth Village DDSO (Thiells)	1911	2000	132	132	132	234.12
	Long Island DDSO (Commack)	1965	NO	348	348	350	216.00
	Long Island DDSO (Melville)	1965	1992				
	Manhattan Ctr. (New York)	1972	1992				
	Monroe DDSO (Rochester)	1969	NO	223	223	227	DNF

[6] Includes costs of day programs, transportation, therapies, and other services not normally associated with residential costs.

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
NY cont.	Newark Ctr. (Newark)	1878	1991				
	Perry ICF/MR (Perry)	1987	NO	24	24	24	900.00[7]
	Rome Ctr. (Rome)	1894	1989				
	Sampson State School (Willard)	1961	1971				
	Staten Island DDSO (Staten Island)	1987	NO	24	24	24	228.54
	Staten Island DDSO (Staten Island)	1947	1988				
	Sunmount DDSO (Tupper Lake)	1965	NO	226	226	217	DNF
	Syracuse DDSO (Syracuse)	1851	1997	28	28	53	414.42
	Valatie (Valatie)	1971	1974				
	Taconic DDSO (Wassaic)	1930	NO	598	598	644	259.22
	Westchester Ctr. (Tarrytown)	1979	1988				
	Western NY DDSO (West Seneca)	1962	NO	350	350	378	212.95
	Wilton DDSO (Wilton)	1960	1995				
NC	Black Mountain Ctr. (Black Mountain)	1982	NO	92	159	95	246.00
	Broughton Ctr. (Morganton)	1883	1994				
	Caswell Ctr. (Kinston)	1914	NO	672	672	665	231.00
	Murdoch Ctr. (Butner)	1957	NO	645	645	627	222.00
	O'Berry Ctr. (Goldsboro)	1957	NO	410	410	418	234.00
	Western Carolina Ctr. (Morganton)	1963	NO	396	396	400	248.00
ND	Grafton Ctr. (Grafton)	1904	NO	148	148	147	340.00
	San Haven State Hosp. (Dunseith)	1973	1987				
OH	Apple Creek Ctr. (Apple Creek)	1931	NO	221	221	230	246.83
	Athens Mental Health & Dev. Ctr. (Athens)	1975	1994				
	Broadview Ctr. (Broadview Hgts.)	1967	1992				
	Cambridge Ctr. (Cambridge)	1965	NO	115	115	116	251.02
	Cambridge Mental Health Ctr. (Cambridge)	1978	1990				
	Central Ohio Psychiatric Hosp. (Columbus)	1978e	1994				
	Cleveland Ctr. (Cleveland)	1976	1988				
	Columbus Ctr. (Columbus)	1857	NO	152	152	156	259.85
	Dayton Ctr. (Dayton)	1979	1983				
	Dayton Mental Health Ctr. (Dayton)	1978e	1994				
	Gallipolis Ctr. (Gallipolis)	1893	NO	249	249	257	284.26

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
OH cont.	Massillon State Hosp. (Massillon)	1978e	1994				
	Montgomery Ctr. (Huber Heights)	1977	NO	104	104	104	253.00
	Mount Vernon Ctr. (Mount Vernon)	1948	NO	284	284	288	260.26
	Northwest Ohio Ctr. (Toledo)	1977	NO	171	171	171	232.17
	Orient Ctr. (Orient)	1898	1984				
	Southwest Ohio Ctr. (Batavia)	1981	NO	113	113	111	256.01
	Springview (Springfield)	1975	NO	90	90	90	220.00
	Tiffin Ctr. (Tiffin)	1975	NO	216	216	215	255.45
	Toledo Mental Health Ctr. (Toledo)	1978e	1994				
	Warrensville Ctr. (Warrensville)	1975	NO	254	254	246	252.27
	Western Reserve Psychiatric Hab Ctr. (Northfield)	1978	1990				
	Youngstown Ctr. (Mineral Ridge)	1980	NO	117	117	118	258.00
OK	Northern Oklahoma Resource Ctr. (Enid)[7]	1909	NO	205	205	214	313.32
	Robert M. Greer Memorial Ctr. (Enid)	1992	NO	52	52	50	325.00
	Hisson Memorial Ctr. (Sand Springs)	1964	1994				
	Southern Oklahoma Resource Ctr. (Pauls Valley)	1952	NO	296	296	279	216.69
OR	Columbia Park Hosp. & Trng. Ctr. (The Dalles)	1963	1977				
	Eastern Oregon Trng. Ctr. (Pendleton)	1964	NO	61	61	66	395.48
	Fairview Trng. Ctr. (Salem)	1908	NO	366	366	368	508.35
PA	Allentown Mental Retardation Unit (Allentown)	1974	1988				
	Altoona Ctr.(Altoona)[8]	1982	NO	135	135	135	186.00
	Clarks Summit Mental Retardation Unit (Clarks Summit)	1974	1992				
	Cresson Ctr. (Cresson)	1964	1982				
	Embreeville Ctr. (Coatesville)	1972	1997	100	100	115	422.00
	Ebensburg Ctr. (Ebensburg)	1957	NO	427	427	432	260.00

[7] Administrative change. The Center is still located on the grounds of the Enid State School.

[8] Altoona Center began as a unit of Cresson Center. It became independent upon the closing of Cresson Center in 1982.

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
PA cont.	Hamburg Ctr. (Hamburg)	1960	NO	315	315	320	280.00
	Harrisburg Mental Retardation Unit (Harrisburg)	1972	1982				
	Hollidaysburg Mental Retardation Ctr. (Hollidaysburg)	1974	1976				
	Laurelton Ctr. (Laurelton)	1920	1998	194	194	193	290.26
	Marcy Ctr. (Pittsburgh)	1975	1982				
	Mayview Mental Retardation Unit (Mayview)	1974	NO	62	62	65	250.00
	Pennhurst Ctr. (Pennhurst)	1908	1988				
	Philadelphia Mental Retardation Unit (Philadelphia)	1983	1989				
	Polk Ctr. (Polk)	1897	NO	692	692	684	244.00
	Selinsgrove Ctr. (Selinsgrove)	1929	NO	670	670	672	255.00
	Somerset Mental Retardation Unit (Somerset)	1974	1996				
	Torrance Mental Retardation Unit (Torrance)	1974	NO	40	40	40	313.00
	Warren Mental Retardation Unit (Warren)	1975	1976				
	Wernersville Mental Retardation Unit (Wernersville)	1974	1987				
	Western Ctr. (Canonsburg)	1962	YES	183	183	210	367.00
	White Haven Ctr. (White Haven)	1956	NO	353	353	353	DNF
	Woodhaven Ctr. (Philadelphia)[9]	1974	1985				
RI	Dorothea Dix Unit (Cranston)	1982	1989				
	Dr. Joseph H. Ladd Ctr. (N. Kingstown)	1908	1994				
	Zamborano Memorial Hosp. (Wallum Lake)	1967	1989				
SC	Midlands Ctr. (Columbia)	1956	NO	379	379	408	191.00
	Pee Dee Ctr. (Florence)	1971	NO	300	300	303	190.56
	Thad E. Saleeby Ctr. (Hartsville)	DNF	NO	103	103	103	147.74
	Coastal Ctr. (Ladson)	1968	NO	274	274	282	193.50
	Whitten Ctr. (Clinton)	1920	NO	600	600	650	178.00
SD	Custer State Ctr. (Custer)	1964	1996				
	Redfield State Ctr. (Redfield)	1903	NO	252	252	257	197.46
TN	Arlington Ctr. (Arlington)	1969	NO	364e	364e	363e	330.87e
	Clover Bottom Ctr. (Donelson)	1923	NO	415	415	412	279.42
	Greene Valley Ctr. (Greeneville)	1960	NO	494	494	534	211.56

[9]Woodhaven, although state-owned, became nonstate-operated in 1985.

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
TN cont.	Harold Jordan Habilitation Ctr. (Nashville)	1979	NO	31	31	31	DNF
	Winston Ctr. (Bolivar)	1979	1997	110	110	125	226.96
TX	Abilene State School (Abilene)	1957	NO	640	640	640	172.00
	Austin State School (Austin)	1917	NO	436	436	446	151.17
	Brenham State School (Brenham)	1974	NO	523	523	523	164.87
	Corpus Christi State School (Corpus Christi)	1970	NO	391	391	396	165.00
	Denton State School (Denton)	1960	NO	683	683	670	158.00
	El Paso State School (El Paso)	1973	NO	121	121	118	139.46
	Ft. Worth State School (Ft. Worth)	1976	1996				
	Lubbock State School (Lubbock)	1969	NO	401	401	390	173.10
	Lufkin State School (Lufkin)	1962	NO	490	490	488	169.08
	Mexia State School (Mexia)	1946	NO	609	609	618	190.85
	Richmond State School (Richmond)	1968	NO	685	685	688	174.49
	Rio Grande State School (Harlingen)	1973	NO	92	92	90	116.59
	San Angelo State School (Carlsbad)	1969	NO	354	354	348	128.83
	San Antonio State School (San Antonio)	1978	NO	310	310	305	159.71
	Travis State School (Austin)	1961	1996				
UT	Utah State Trng. School (American Fork)	1931	NO	311	311	328	233.55
VT	Brandon Trng. School (Brandon)	1915	1993				
VA	Eastern State Hosp. (Williamsburg)	DNF	1990				
	Central Virginia Trng. Ctr. (Lynchburg)	1911	NO	929	929	978	DNF
	Northern Virginia Trng. Ctr. (Fairfax)	1973	NO	190	190	214	289.00
	Southeastern Virginia Trng. Ctr. (Chesapeake)	1975	NO	197	197	195	211.00
	Southside Virginia Trng. Ctr. (Petersburg)	1939	NO	575	575	593	210.40
	Southwestern State Hosp. (Marion)	1887	1988				
	Southwestern Virginia Trng. Ctr. (Hillsville)	1976	NO	220	220	212	193.00

State	Large State MR/DD Facilities or Units Operating 1960-1996	Year MR/DD Facility Opened	Year Closed or Projected to Close by 2000	MR/DD Residents on 6/30/96	All Residents on 6/30/96	Average Daily MR/DD Residents FY 96	Average per Diem Expenditures FY 96
VA cont.	Western State Hosp. (Stanton)[10]	1828	1990				
WA	Fircrest School (Seattle)	1959	NO	373	373	375	309.80
	Interlake School (Medical Lake)	1967	1994				
	Lakeland Village School (Medical Lake)	1915	NO	286	286	291	309.49
	Frances Haddon Morgan Ctr. (Bremerton)	1972	NO	53	53	56	DNF
	Rainer School (Buckley)	1939	NO	451	451	461	288.55
	Yakima Valley School (Selah)	1958	NO	112	112	112	336.00
WV	Colin Anderson Ctr. (St. Mary's)	1932	1997	75	75	74	450.00
	Greenbrier Ctr. (Lewisburg)[11]	1974	1990				
	Spencer State Hosp. (Spencer)	1893	1989				
	Weston State Hosp. (Weston)	1985	1988				
WI	Central Wisconsin Ctr. (Madison)	1959	NO	462	462	467	270.00
	Northern Wisconsin Ctr. (Chippewa Falls)	1895	NO	323	323	345	285.00
	Southern Wisconsin Ctr. (Union Grove)	1919	NO	409	409	428	242.00
WY	Wyoming State Trng. School (Lander)	1912	NO	145	145	145	320.00

[10] Western State Hospital no longer has an identifiable MR unit.

[11] Became private in 1990. Closed March 15, 1994.

CHAPTER 4
CHARACTERISTICS AND MOVEMENT OF RESIDENTS OF LARGE STATE FACILITIES

Robert W. Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin
Nohoon Kwak
Lynda Anderson

This chapter provides information about the characteristics and movement of large state MR/DD facility residents in Fiscal Year 1996 based on a survey of all large state facilities operating in the United States on June 30, 1996. Large state facilities included state-operated facilities for persons with MR/DD with 16 or more residents or distinct units for 16 or more persons with MR/DD within large state facilities primarily serving other populations. A description of the state facility survey is provided in the "Methodology" section ("Individual Large State Facility Survey").

Characteristics of Residents

Table 1.13 presents a summary of selected age, diagnostic and functional characteristics of residents of large (16 or more residents) state facilities for persons with MR/DD (hereafter "large state facilities") on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996.

Age of Residents

There has been continuing aging of the population of residents of large state facilities since 1977. Age statistics are based on reporting large state facilities for 1977, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996. These statistics are based on the reports of large state facilities housing 77% of all residents on June 30, 1996 (and between 76% and 84% in the earlier years). As shown in Table 1.11 the proportion of children and youth (birth to 21 years) living in large state facilities declined from 35.8% of all residents in 1977 to 5.0% in 1994, while the proportion of residents 63 years and older increased from 3.7% of all residents in June 1977 to 7.7% of all residents in June 1996. Despite the substantial increase in the proportion of residents 63 years and older in large state facilities, the total number of residents 63 years and older actually decreased by about 1,080 residents (to 4,505) between 1977 and 1996. The most notably changing age cohort of large state facility residents in recent years has been that of "middle age" persons (40-62 years). Between 1991 and 1996 this group grew from 32.5% to 42.7%of the large state facility residents, as the demographics of the "baby boom" became increasingly evident. By June 1996 over half (50.7%) of all state institution residents were 40 years or older. This compares with one-third (33.3%) just 9 years earlier, and less than 40% (39.5%), just 5 years earlier. Still in the 5 years between June 30, 1991 and June 30, 1996, the number of individuals 40 years and older living in large state facilities decreased by about 1,650 persons with somewhat more of the decrease from the 63 years and older category (930 persons) than from the 40-62 year category (720 persons). As will be evident from admission statistics presented later, the shifts among age categories during the last 5 years was primarily because the stable residential population of large state facilities got older and "aged out" of the young adult category (22-39 years) and into the middle aged category. Middle-aged individuals being admitted to large state facilities contributed relatively little to these shifts. As shown in Figure 1.6, the June 30, 1996 estimate of 2,937 children and youth (0-21 years) making up 5.0% of the large state facility population nationwide reflects dramatic decreases during the second half of this century and particularly the past quarter century. In 1950, 48,354 of the 124,304 large state facility residents (38.9%) were 21 years or younger. By 1965 the population of children and youth had increased by 91,592, and made up 48.9% of all large state facility residents. Subsequent annual decreases brought the population of children and youth to 54,130 (35.8%) in 1977, to 9,230 (10.6%) in 1989, 6,944 (8.7%) in 1991, to 4,001 (6.1%) in 1994 and eventually to 2,937 (5.0%) in June 30, 1996.

Table 1.13 Characteristics of Residents of Large State Facilities on June 30: 1977, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996

Characteristic		June 30 of the Year						
		1977 (N= 151,112)	1982 (N= 119,335)	1987 (N= 94,695)	1989 (N= 87,071)	1991 (N= 79,407)	1994 (N= 65,735)	1996 (N= 58,320)
Age	0-21 years	35.8%	22.0%	12.7%	10.6%	8.7%	6.1%	5.0%
	22-39 years	41.3	50.2	54.1	52.4	51.8	47.1	44.6
	40-62 years	19.2	22.9	27.3	30.3	32.5	39.7	42.7
	63+ years	3.7	5.0	6.0	6.8	7.0	7.1	7.7
Level of Retardation	Mild/No MR	10.4	7.1	7.2	6.7	6.9	7.0	7.4
	Moderate	16.4	12.5	9.8	10.1	9.2	9.0	8.9
	Severe	27.6	24.2	20.0	19.5	19.1	18.5	17.8
	Profound	45.6	56.2	63.0	63.7	64.8	65.5	65.9
Functional Limitations	Needs assistance or supervision in walking	23.3	25.5	29.5	31.2	32.4	33.4	35.7
	Cannot communicate basic desires verbally	43.5	49.1	54.8	55.3	57.1	56.0	59.4
	Needs assistance or supervision in toileting	34.1	38.0	46.6	45.4	45.9	55.3	57.0
	Needs assistance or supervision in eating	21.4	35.0	37.8	38.2	37.8	49.7	50.9
	Needs assistance or supervision in dressing self	55.8	60.9	60.5	60.4	61.1	65.6	66.1

Figure 1.6
Total and Childhood (0-21 Years) Populations of Large State MR/DD Facilities, 1950-1996



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Level of Mental Retardation

Table 1.13 also presents a breakdown of the diagnosed level of mental retardation of residents of large state facilities on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996. These statistics show the continuing trend toward reduced numbers and proportions of persons in the mild (or no), to severe ranges of mental retardation and increased proportions (but reduced numbers) of persons with profound mental retardation in large state facilities. In 1996, based on the reports of facilities housing 75.9% of all large state facility residents, there were an estimated 4,343 large state facility residents who had mild or no mental retardation (7.4% of all residents) as compared with an estimated 15,700 in 1977 and 5,479 in 1991 It is notable, however, that while the number of persons with mild mental retardation in state institutions has been decreasing (e.g., by about 1,100 persons between 1991 and 1996), their proportion among all residents has been increasing (e.g., from 6.7% in 1989 to 7.0% in 1991 to 7.4% in 1996). In contrast, populations of persons with moderate and severe mental retardation have been decreasing more rapidly than large state facility residents as a whole.

The proportion of large state facility residents with profound mental retardation increased substantially from 1977 to 1996, from 45.6% of all residents to 65.9% of all residents. But despite these proportional increases, the actual number of persons with profound mental retardation in large state facilities decreased by over 30,000 people between 1977 and 1996, from 68,907 to an estimated 38,417 people. In just the five years between June 30, 1991 and June 30, 1996 the number of large state facility residents with profound mental retardation decreased by 13,039 people (or 25%). Figure 1.7 shows the same basic statistics as those in Table 1.13 with the addition of data from 1964 and 1985 surveys (Scheerenberger, 1965, 1986). It shows that while large state facility populations decreased by about 38,500 residents between 1964 and 1977, the number of residents with profound mental retardation actually increased by about 20,000. During the same period the number of large state facility residents with mild, moderate, severe or no mental retardation decreased nearly 50,000 people from 131,100 to 82,200. In June 1996 there were 19,903 large state facility residents with mild, moderate, severe or no mental retardation, only about 15% of the number 30 years earlier.

Figure 1.7
Level of Retardation of Residents of Large State Facilities on June 30 of Selected Years, 1964-1996



Functional Characteristics

Table 1.13 also shows the percentage of residents of large state facilities reported to have functional limitations in certain important activities of daily living. In this study, each of the large state facilities surveyed was asked to report the number of their residents who: 1) "cannot walk without assistance or supervision," 2) "cannot communicate basic desires verbally," 3) "cannot use the toilet without assistance or supervision," 4) "cannot feed self without assistance or supervision." and 5) "cannot dress self without assistance or supervision." National tables for 1996 are shown in Table 1.13 with comparable statistics from 1977, 1982, 1987, 1989, 1991 and 1994. There was the continued expected association between the slightly increasing proportion of profoundly intellectually impaired populations and the higher proportion of residents reported to have certain functional limitations. In 1996, 35.7% of large state facility residents were reported to need assistance or supervision in walking and 59.4% to be unable to communicate basic desires verbally. Over half of large state facility residents were reported to be unable to use the toilet independently without assistance or supervision (57.0% or to be unable to feed themselves without assistance or supervision (50.9%). Nearly two-thirds (66.1%) of residents were reported to need assistance or supervision in getting dressed. In the five years between 1991 and 1996 there were rather substantial increases in the percentage of residents with substantial limitations in toileting themselves (45.9% to 57.0%), feeding themselves (37.8% to 50.9%) and dressing themselves (61.1% to 66.1%). As will be shown subsequently, there continued to be considerable inter-state variability in these patterns.

Age by Level of Mental Retardation

Table 1.14 shows the distribution of large state facility residents by age and level of mental retardation groupings. Facilities housing 75.9% of all large state facility residents on June 30, 1996 reported statistics on this distribution. Clearly within large state facilities, residents who are older less often have profound cognitive limitations than residents who are relatively younger. Only 53.9% of residents 63 years or older and 58.1% of residents 55 years or older had profound mental retardation as compared with 67.2% of all residents 54 years or younger. Conversely the youngest large state facility residents tended most often to have severe cognitive impairments. Three-quarters (74.6%) of large state facility residents 14 years and younger had profound mental retardation as compared

Table 1.14 Distribution of Residents of Large State Facilities by Level of Mental Retardation and Age on June 30, 1996

Level of Mental Retardation	Chronological Age							
	0-9	10-14	15-21	22-39	40-54	55-62	63+	Total
Mild or No MR	9 (6.9%) [0.3%]	22 (5.7%) [0.7%]	245 (14.3%) [7.4%]	1,533 (7.7%) [46.2%]	950 (6.0%) [28.7%]	237 (7.4%) [7.1%]	319 (9.3%) [9.6%]	3,315 (7.4%) [100.0%]
Moderate	1 (0.8%) [0.0+%]	41 (10.6%) [1.0%]	225 (13.2%) [5.7%]	1,678 (8.5%) [42.4%]	1,369 (8.7%) [34.6%]	268 (6.8%) [6.8%]	373 (10.8%) [9.4%]	3,955 (8.9%) [100.0%]
Severe	13 (9.9%) [0.2%]	45 (11.7%) [0.6%]	238 (13.9%) [3.0%]	3,461 (17.4%) [43.7%]	2,585 (16.4%) [32.6%]	686 (21.5%) [8.7%]	893 (26.0%) [11.3%]	7,921 (17.8%) [100.0%]
Profound	108 (82.4%) [0.4%]	277 (71.9%) [0.9%]	1,003 (58.6%) [3.4%]	13,181 (66.4%) [45.0%]	10,896 (69.0%) [37.2%]	2,003 (62.7%) [6.8%]	1,854 (53.9%) [6.3%]	29,322 (65.9%) [100.0%]
Total	131 (100.0%) [0.3%]	385 (100.0%) [0.9%]	1,711 (100.0%) [3.8%]	19,853 (100.0%) [44.6%]	15,800 (100.0%) [35.5%]	3,194 (100.0%) [7.2%]	3,439 (100.0%) [7.7%]	44,513 (100.0%) [100.0%]

Note: The percentage in parentheses indicates the distribution of persons by age with different levels of mental retardation. The percentage in brackets indicates the distribution of persons by level of mental retardation within the different age categories. Statistics are based on the reports of large state facilities housing 44,513 (76.3%) of the 58,320 residents of large state facilities on June 30, 1996.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with 65.8% of the large state facility population older than 14 years. Other than the near elimination of children and youth from among state institution populations, perhaps the most remarkable demographic statistics is that a majority of large state facility residents (54.1%) are now persons with profound mental retardation between the ages of 22 and 54 years. Four of five (80.1%) of state institution residents were between 22 years and 54 years old.

State-by-State Resident Characteristics

State-by-state statistics on resident characteristics are based on aggregated data on all reporting large state facilities in each state. State breakdowns are provided only for states in which the reporting facilities for any specific characteristic housed at least 60% of all large state facility residents.

Gender of Residents

Table 1.15 shows the distribution of large state facility residents by gender. In all reporting states males made up the majority of large state facility residents. Nationally 60.0% of residents were male, with states ranging from a low of 51.8% (Georgia) to a high of 79.6% (Hawaii). For the most part the proportion of male residents has remained relatively stable in recent years (57.0% in 1977, 57.4% in 1982, 59.0% in 1989, 58.5% in 1991, 59.3% in 1994, and 60.0% in 1996).

Age Distribution of Residents

Table 1.16 presents the state-by-state age distribution of residents in large state facilities on June 30, 1996. The table shows the great variability across states in the ages of residents. Differences were particularly notable in the number of children and youth (0-21 years) and the number of older residents (63 years and older). Nationwide, 5.0% of all large state facility residents were 21 years or younger. In 18 of 44 reporting states 3% or less of large state facility residents were 21 years or younger (as compared with 9 states in June 1991). In contrast 8 states reported 10% or more of their large state facility residents as being in the 0-21 year age range (as compared with 15 in June 1991). In the 5 years between 1991 and 1996 in the 38 states with facilities housing 60% of the total large state facility population reporting in both years, there was a reduction in the proportion of residents 21 years and younger in 35 states, no change in one and a slight increase in two. More importantly in all but one state there was a decrease in the actual number of children and youth residing in large state facilities.

Nationally 14.9% of large state facility residents were 55 years and older, as compared with 13.8% in 1994. Individual states ranged from more than a quarter of all residents being 55 years and older to virtually no residents in this age range. Northeastern states typically had more than a quarter of their large state facility populations made up of persons 55 years old or older. In Massachusetts a third (34.1%) of large state facility residents were 55 years or older, while in 13 states over 15% of large state facility residents were 55 years or older. In only 4 of the 40 reporting states were less than 5% of state institution residents 55 years or older. It is notable that while the largest group of large state facility residents on June 30, 1996 (44.6%) were between the ages of 22 and 39 years, that proportion decreased from 51.8% in 1989. In the same 7 year period (1989-1996) the proportion of residents 40 years or older increased from 36.0% to over half (50.4%) of all large state facility residents nationally. The proportion of large state facility residents who are 40 or older is substantially greater than the 40% of the general U.S. population in this age range, but is clearly being influenced by the same demographic trend - the aging of the "baby boom" generation.

Table 1.15 Gender Distribution of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996

State	Gender of Residents Male	Female	Total
ALABAMA	58.0	42.0	100.0%
ALASKA	52.6	47.4	100.0
ARIZONA	•	•	•
ARKANSAS	61.4	38.6	100.0
CALIFORNIA	59.9	40.1	100.0
COLORADO	63.2	36.8	100.0
CONNECTICUT	•	•	•
DELAWARE	55.7	44.3	100.0
D.C.	NA	NA	NA
FLORIDA	61.5	38.5	100.0
GEORGIA	51.8	48.2	100.0
HAWAII	79.6	20.4	100.0
IDAHO	66.7	33.3	100.0
ILLINOIS	64.9	35.1	100.0
INDIANA	61.5	38.5	100.0
IOWA	67.5	32.5	100.0
KANSAS	•	•	•
KENTUCKY	59.9	40.1	100.0
LOUISIANA	56.9	43.1	100.0
MAINE	NA	NA	NA
MARYLAND	63.0	37.0	100.0
MASSACHUSETTS	54.0	46.0	100.0
MICHIGAN	71.5	28.5	100.0
MINNESOTA	65.3	34.7	100.0
MISSISSIPPI	59.9	40.1	100.0
MISSOURI	64.3	35.8	100.0
MONTANA	66.9	33.1	100.0
NEBRASKA	57.5	32.5	100.0
NEVADA	64.6	35.4	100.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NA	NA	NA
NEW JERSEY	59.0	41.0	100.0
NEW MEXICO	•	•	•
NEW YORK	61.0	39.0	100.0
NORTH CAROLINA	57.4	42.6	100.0
NORTH DAKOTA	58.8	41.2	100.0
OHIO	64.3	35.7	100.0
OKLAHOMA	65.3	34.7	100.0
OREGON	•	•	•
PENNSYLVANIA	54.4	45.6	100.0
RHODE ISLAND	NA	NA	NA
SOUTH CAROLINA	58.9	41.1	100.0
SOUTH DAKOTA	61.9	38.1	100.0
TENNESSEE	59.5	40.5	100.0
TEXAS	59.3	40.7	100.0
UTAH	56.9	43.1	100.0
VERMONT	NA	NA	NA
VIRGINIA	58.7	41.3	100.0
WASHINGTON	60.0	40.0	100.0
WEST VIRGINIA	57..3	42.7	100.0
WISCONSIN	61.6	38.4	100.0
WYOMING	•	•	•
U.S. Total	60.0	40.0	100.0

Note. Data in this table are based on the reports of large state facilities which housed 44,513 (76.3%) of the 58,320 large state facility residents on June 30, 1996. Specific state data are omitted (•) where the reporting facilities in a specific state housed less than 60% of the total large state facility residents. NA is used to indicate states which did not operate large state facilities on June 30, 1996 (or in the case of Maine closed the facility before this survey).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1.16 Age of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996

State	Age of Residents in Years 0-14	15-21	22-39	40-54	55-62	63+	Total
ALABAMA	.2%	1.7%	32.3%	48.5%	8.0%	9.4%	100.0%
ALASKA	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ARIZONA	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
ARKANSAS	2.9	9.5	54.1	30.4	2.9	0.3	100.0
CALIFORNIA	2.9	3.6	40.8	39.7	6.2	6.8	100.0
COLORADO	3.1	4.4	41.0	42.2	6.8	2.5	100.0
CONNECTICUT	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
DELAWARE	0.0	2.1	33.3	41.6	8.3	14.8	100.0
D.C.	0.0	0.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
FLORIDA	0.0	0.3	43.3	45.6	5.9	4.8	100.0
GEORGIA	3.7	5.8	47.0	29.9	10.9	2.8	100.0
HAWAII	0.0	0.0	42.9	49.0	2.0	6.1	100.0
IDAHO	4.9	7.3	39.0	35.8	4.9	8.1	100.0
ILLINOIS	1.1	3.8	53.8	31.2	5.8	4.3	100.0
INDIANA	0.0	1.0	48.5	37.3	9.0	4.2	100.0
IOWA	3.4	7.3	42.6	36.8	4.4	5.6	100.0
KANSAS	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
KENTUCKY	0.2	4.8	58.2	32.5	3.7	0.6	100.0
LOUISIANA	1.7	8.3	46.0	30.2	6.3	7.6	100.0
MAINE	0.0	0.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MARYLAND	1.9	3.0	43.8	40.4	5.9	5.1	100.0
MASSACHUSETTS	0.0	0.0	26.4	39.5	15.3	18.8	100.0
MICHIGAN	0.0	11.5	54.2	24.0	6.2	4.1	100.0
MINNESOTA	0.0	3.0	43.6	39.9	4.1	9.4	100.0
MISSISSIPPI	6.6	13.2	47.5	22.5	5.5	4.7	100.0
MISSOURI	0.0	5.5	50.4	36.1	5.1	2.9	*
MONTANA	0.0	3.2	40.8	42.7	7.0	6.4	*
NEBRASKA	1.7	2.0	35.4	43.5	8.4	9.1	100.0
NEVADA	3.1	13.7	59.0	22.4	1.9	0.0	*
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0.0	0.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NEW JERSEY	0.0	1.1	51.7	28.6	6.1	12.6	100.0
NEW MEXICO	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
NEW YORK	0.8	2.1	36.4	36.1	8.5	16.0	100.0
NORTH CAROLINA	0.3	1.6	43.0	37.6	10.1	7.4	100.0
NORTH DAKOTA	1.4	6.2	41.4	38.7	6.8	5.4	100.0
OHIO	0.0	1.5	36.1	42.8	9.5	10.1	100.0
OKLAHOMA	1.2	19.4	51.8	27.3	0.4	0.0	100.0
OREGON	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
PENNSYLVANIA	0.0	0.5	33.9	41.5	9.5	14.6	100.0
RHODE ISLAND	0.0	0.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.0
SOUTH CAROLINA	2.1	7.4	42.0	31.3	8.8	8.5	*
SOUTH DAKOTA	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
TENNESSEE	1.4	4.5	42.7	35.3	8.3	7.8	100.0
TEXAS	0.5	4.4	45.4	32.2	7.1	10.4	100.0
UTAH	1.0	3.9	53.0	34.4	5.5	2.3	100.0
VERMONT	0.0	0.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	100.0
VIRGINIA	0.4	4.6	45.5	34.7	7.5	7.2	100.0
WASHINGTON	0.1	2.4	42.1	43.4	7.9	4.2	100.0
WEST VIRGINIA	0.0	0.0	45.3	49.3	2.7	2.7	*
WISCONSIN	2.8	5.2	49.8	33.4	5.2	3.6	100.0
WYOMING	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
U.S. Total	1.2	3.9	44.6	35.5	7.2	7.7	100.0

Note. Data in this table are based on the reports of large state facilities which housed 44,896 (77.0%) of the 58,320 large state facility residents on June 30, 1996. Specific state data are omitted (*) where the reporting facilities in a specific state did not house at least 60% of the state's total state facility residents. NA is used to indicate states which did not operate a large state facility on June 30, 1994 except that 0.0% is reported for the percentage of total residents who were children (0-14 years) and youth (15-24 years) in these states without large state facilities.

In contrast, children and youth (birth to 21 years), made up 32% of the U.S. population, but only 5.0% of the large state facility population. Persons 63 years and older made up 19.5% of the U.S. population, but only 7.7% of the large state facility population. One reason for the disproportionately low rates of large state facility placement among children and youth are the relatively low overall rates of out-of-home placement of children and youth. (Only an estimated 18% of all persons with MR/DD in all public and private out-of-home placements are between birth and 21 years.) A more specific factor with respect to large state facilities is the concerted effort by most states to restrict the admission of children and youth to them. This is particularly evident in the youngest ages. For example, nationwide 19% of the U.S. population is made up of persons 14 years and younger, but only 1.2% of large state facility populations and 8.8% of all admissions to large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 were persons 14 years and younger. As a comparison in 1965 the majority of persons admitted to large state facilities were 11 years or younger (NIMH, 1966).

The primary reason for the lower proportion of persons 63 years and older in large state facilities than in the general population is the continuing high use of nursing homes for long-term care of older persons with a primary diagnosis of mental retardation and related conditions. In fact, the estimated 4,508 persons 63 years and older in large state facilities in 1996 was considerably less than the estimated 11,200 persons 65 years and older with a primary diagnosis of mental retardation in nursing homes (based on the total 1996 nursing home residents in this survey and the age characteristics of nursing home residents with a primary diagnosis of mental retardation from the 1985 National Nursing Home Survey; Lakin, Hill & Anderson; 1991).

Level of Mental Retardation

Table 1.17 presents the state-by-state distributions of residents of large state facilities by reported level of mental retardation. Thirty eight states are reported; 5 states are not reported because they operated no large state facilities at the same time of this survey and 8 states are not reported because this statistic was not reported by facilities housing at least 60% of the state's total large state facility population.

In Table 1.17 persons reported not to have mental retardation (or to have "borderline" mental retardation) have been included in the "mild" mental retardation group. Nationally 65.9% of large state facility residents were indicated to have profound mental retardation. In all but five of the reporting states a majority of large state facility residents were reported to have profound mental retardation. In 12 of the 38 reporting states more than 70% of large state facility residents were reported to have profound mental retardation.

A great deal of variability was also found in states' use of large state facilities to house persons with mild and moderate mental retardation. Nationwide, 16.3% of residents were reported to have mild or moderate mental retardation. In 11 of the reporting states persons with mild or moderate mental retardation made up more than a quarter of large state facility populations; in five states less than 10% of state institution populations were made up of persons with mild or moderate mental retardation. As shown in Table 1.13 the proportion of residents with mild mental retardation has been increasing nationwide in recent years, related in part to the increasing proportion of residents indicated to have psychiatric disorders (31% in 1996).

Selected Additional Conditions

Blind. Table 1.18 presents the reported prevalence of selected secondary conditions of large state facility residents. Nationwide, 15.3% of large state facility residents were reported to be functionally blind in 1996 (defined as having little or no useful vision). This compares with 12.6% in 1991. Eight states reported 20% or more residents to be functionally blind; 10 states reported less than 10% of large state facility residents were blind.

Deaf. Nationally, 7.4% of large state facility residents were reported to be functionally deaf (having little or no useful hearing). This compared with 5.6% in 1991. Prevalence rates varied from more than 14% in 4 states to less than 7% in 19 states.

Epilepsy. Nationwide, 46.1% of large state facility residents were reported to have epilepsy. This compares with 44.6% 5 years earlier. Nearly three-quarters of all reporting states (73.7%) reported prevalence rates for seizure disorders among state institution residents of between 40% and 60%.

Table 1.17 Level of Mental Retardation of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996

State	Level of Mental Retardation				
	Mild+	Moderate	Severe	Profound	Total
ALABAMA	9.4	9.1	16.7	64.8	100.0
ALASKA	•	•	•	•	•
ARIZONA	•	•	•	•	•
ARKANSAS	2.6	10.0	20.9	66.5	100.0
CALIFORNIA	2.2	4.8	15.8	77.2	100.0
COLORADO	5.0	6.8	6.2	82.0	100.0
CONNECTICUT	•	•	•	•	•
DELAWARE	3.8	4.5	19.2	72.5	•
D.C.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
FLORIDA	8.4	11.9	14.3	65.5	100.0
GEORGIA	5.8	11.3	21.8	61.2	100.0
HAWAII	10.2	14.3	30.6	44.9	100.0
IDAHO	13.0	13.0	17.9	56.1	100.0
ILLINOIS	6.8	12.1	17.2	63.9	100.0
INDIANA	17.5	13.2	15.4	53.9	100.0
IOWA	15.9	16.1	17.6	50.4	100.0
KANSAS	•	•	•	•	•
KENTUCKY	3.3	8.2	22.9	65.6	100.0
LOUISIANA	7.2	7.2	13.6	72.1	100.0
MAINE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MARYLAND	8.0	9.5	14.2	68.3	100.0
MASSACHUSETTS	7.6	9.2	23.7	59.5	100.0
MICHIGAN	41.1	14.0	17.5	27.4	100.0
MINNESOTA	26.3	6.8	15.8	51.1	100.0
MISSISSIPPI	3.8	7.1	13.9	75.2	100.0
MISSOURI	21.4	16.7	30.9	30.9	100.0
MONTANA	17.2	8.9	3.8	70.1	100.0
NEBRASKA	6.4	6.4	12.0	75.2	100.0
NEVADA	17.4	17.4	18.0	47.2	100.0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NEW JERSEY	7.8	7.8	16.6	67.8	100.0
NEW MEXICO	•	•	•	•	•
NEW YORK	21.1	9.5	15.2	54.2	100.0
NORTH CAROLINA	2.0	5.2	16.0	76.8	100.0
NORTH DAKOTA	2.3	6.1	7.4	66.2	100.0
OHIO	3.4	14.9	22.7	59.0	100.0
OKLAHOMA	18.6	17.0	25.7	38.7	100.0
OREGON	•	•	•	•	•
PENNSYLVANIA	5.0	8.1	19.7	67.2	100.0
RHODE ISLAND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SOUTH CAROLINA	5.9	6.8	10.3	76.9	100.0
SOUTH DAKOTA	•	•	•	•	•
TENNESSEE	2.1	4.4	12.9	80.6	100.0
TEXAS	7.1	9.8	25.9	57.2	100.0
UTAH	7.7	4.2	13.5	74.6	100.0
VERMONT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
VIRGINIA	8.9	9.7	19.0	62.5	100.0
WASHINGTON	4.4	9.2	17.7	68.8	100.0
WEST VIRGINIA	1.3	1.3	5.3	92.0	100.0
WISCONSIN	2.4	3.6	16.8	77.3	100.0
WYOMING	•	•	•	•	•
U.S. Total	7.4	8.9	17.8	65.9	100.0

Note. Data in this table are based on the reports of large state facilities which housed 44,513 (76.3%) of the 58,320 large state facility residents on June 30, 1996. Specific state data are omitted (*) where the reporting facilities in a specific state housed less than 60% of the total large state facility residents. NA is used to indicate states which did not operate large state facilities on June 30, 1996.

Cerebral palsy. Nationwide 22.6% of large state facility residents were indicated to have cerebral palsy. This compares to a reported rate of 21.6% five years earlier in 1991. The reported prevalence of cerebral palsy varied considerably from state to state. In 11 states the prevalence of cerebral palsy among large state facility residents was indicated to be less than 15% and in 10 other states it was indicated to be greater than 30%.

Behavior disorder. Individual large state facilities were asked to report the number of their residents with behavior disorders. "Behavior disorder" was defined simply as behavior that is sufficiently problematic as to require special staff attention. The absence of a definition expressed in behavioral terms of frequency or severity may account for some of the deviation among states from the national average of 45.7%. In 5 states two-thirds or more of large state facility residents were reported to have behavior disorders; in 9 states less than one-third of the large state facility residents were reported to have behavioral disorders. The reported prevalence of behavior disorders has remained between 45% and 48% since 1987.

Psychiatric condition. Individual facilities were also asked how many of their residents had psychiatric disorders requiring the attention of psychiatric personnel. Nationwide 31.0% of large state facility residents were reported to be receiving psychiatric attention for psychiatric conditions. This statistic was a little different from the 30.6% reported in 1994, the first year in which this survey requested this information. The aggregated statistics for 30 of the 38 states providing these data for at least 60% of all residents were in the range between 20% and 40% of all residents.

Multiple conditions. In all 64.8% of large state facility residents were reported to have two or more of the above conditions in addition to mental retardation. This was a slight increase from the 62.4% reported in 1994. The reported prevalence multiple conditions in 1996 was considerably higher than the 56.7% reported in 1991, but again "psychiatric disorders" were not included in the 1991 survey. Thirteen states reported 75% of state institution residents as having multiple conditions; 7 reported less than 50%.

Selected Functional Assistance Needs of Residents

Table 1.19 presents selected functional limitations of residents of large state MR/DD facilities. Nationwide 35.7% of residents large state facilities were reported to need assistance or supervision in walking. This represented a steady increase from the 32.4% reported in 1991 and 33.4% reported in 1994. Reported rates varied from 68.0% in West Virginia to 18.0% in Nevada. In 9 states more than half of the large state facility residents were reported to need assistance in walking. In 3 states less than a quarter of large state facility residents were reported to need assistance in walking.

Nationwide, 66.1% of large state facility residents were reported to need assistance or supervision in dressing. This compares with 61.1% in 1991. In 14 states 70% or more of large state facility residents were reported to need assistance dressing. Only 2 states reported less than 50% of its large state facility residents in need of assistance or supervision in dressing.

Nationwide, 50.9% of large state facility residents were reported to need assistance or supervision in feeding themselves. This compares with 37.8% reported to need assistance in feeding themselves in 1991. Eleven states reported that 60% or more of their large state facility residents needed help or supervision in eating while 8 states indicated that 40% or less of their large state facility populations needed assistance or supervision with eating. Nine of the 46 states operating large state facilities had insufficient reports on this skill (i.e., less than 60% of all residents) to compute a state statistic.

Nationwide 57.0% of large state facility residents were reported to need assistance or supervision with toileting. This was a substantial increase from the 45.9% reported in 1991. Nine states reported more than two-thirds of large state facility residents needing assistance with toileting; 3 states reported less than 40% of large state facility residents needing assistance or supervision in toileting.

A total 59.4% of large state facility residents were reported to be unable to communicate their basic desires verbally. This compares with 57.1% in 1991. Three states reported that more than 75% of their large state facility residents could not communicate verbally; 4 states reported that less than 50% of their large state facility residents could not communicate verbally.

Table 1.18 Selected Additional Conditions of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996

State	Blind[1]	Deaf[2]	Epilepsy	Cerebral Palsy	Behavior Disorder[3]	Psychiatric Disorders[4]	Multiple Conditions[5]
ALABAMA	8.5	5.5	31.9	8.8	38.5	30.5	64.9
ALASKA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
ARIZONA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
ARKANSAS	10.5	3.7	46.3	24.6	63.3	24.0	79.1
CALIFORNIA	24.0	14.0	54.3	41.9	45.5	17.8	82.2
COLORADO	29.2	13.0	41.0	18.0	56.5	34.8	90.0
CONNECTICUT	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
DELAWARE	14.4	2.1	51.6	32.6	43.0	21.3	28.9
D.C.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
FLORIDA	9.2	6.5	35.7	13.6	36.9	36.2	40.0
GEORGIA	13.2	8.0	474	16.3	41.3	23.1	77.2
HAWAII	16.3	6.1	28.6	12.4	87.7	53.1	75.5
IDAHO	9.8	6.5	34.2	31.7	49.6	21.1	95.9
ILLINOIS	14.3	6.3	47.2	18.9	54.8	39.3	84.7
INDIANA	12.6	8.9	43.9	28.6	54.1	35.4	87.9
IOWA	12.3	8.6	44.2	6.3	34.1	75.4	50.4
KANSAS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
KENTUCKY	30.1	15.2	56.4	30.7	30.1	23.5	59.8
LOUISIANA	14.0	7.5	41.1	19.4	36.4	28.6	69.2
MAINE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MARYLAND	17.8	13.5	47.8	19.2	46.7	30.4	30.4
MASSACHUSETTS	16.1	7.3	60.0	22.7	27.3	27.9	39.3
MICHIGAN	9.0	5.9	30.5	5.9	69.5	73.4	72.6
MINNESOTA	11.3	7.1	42.5	11.3	77.4	50.4	72.6
MISSISSIPPI	9.1	5.5	29.3	19.1	45.8	28.3	58.7
MISSOURI	7.2	4.2	39.6	8.3	62.9	39.8	91.1
MONTANA	8.9	3.2	52.9	19.7	15.3	42.0	82.2
NEBRASKA	30.2	3.2	55.0	14.5	83.0	38.6	88.3
NEVADA	11.2	6.2	47.2	18.0	78.3	70.8	87.6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NEW JERSEY	9.5	5.1	46.5	31.5	25.6	22.9	28.1
NEW MEXICO	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
NEW YORK	16.4	9.5	38.4	16.8	58.3	38.8	40.5
NORTH CAROLINA	20.7	7.1	47.2	22.1	31.3	23.3	70.3
NORTH DAKOTA	23.7	14.8	47.3	30.4	44.6	31.8	76.4
OHIO	11.3	5.5	43.3	8.7	57.7	37.5	46.6
OKLAHOMA	2.0	1.7	40.5	10.1	11.2	35.6	54.3
OREGON	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
PENNSYLVANIA	10.7	2.1	47.4	21.0	43.8	29.5	66.0
RHODE ISLAND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SOUTH CAROLINA	18.1	8.8	49.9	16.5	51.7	19.9	73.3
SOUTH DAKOTA	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
TENNESSEE	21.4	5.5	55.4	51.3	42.8	30.1	58.2
TEXAS	16.6	5.5	42.5	17.6	49.3	38.2	66.6
UTAH	37.6	14.1	56.3	57.6	31.2	31.2	92.0
VERMONT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
VIRGINIA	11.9	8.3	43.7	9.2	61.3	28.0	56.2
WASHINGTON	9.4	2.6	36.5	14.7	50.7	34.0	56.8
WEST VIRGINIA	12.0	8.0	60.0	33.3	28.0	25.3	76.0
WISCONSIN	10.9	7.3	63.3	36.8	50.5	35.2	90.8
WYOMING	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
U.S. Total	15.3	7.4	46.1	22.6	45.7	31.0	64.8

Note. Data in this table are based on the reports of large state facilities which housed between 46,354 (79.1% for blind, deaf, epilepsy and cerebral palsy) to 42,500 (72.5% for multiple conditions) of the 58,614 large state facility residents on June 30, 1996. Specific state data are omitted (•) where the reporting facilities in a specific state housed less than 60% of the total large state facility residents. NA is used to indicate states which did not operate large state facilities on June 30, 1996.

[1] Defined as "having little or no useful vision".
[2] Defined as "having little or no useful hearing".
[3] Defined as "challenging behavior requiring special attention of staff".
[4] Defined as "a disorder requiring the attention of psychiatric specialists".
[5] Defined as "having two or more of the indicated conditions in addition to mental retardation".

Table 1.19 Selected Functional Needs of Residents of Large State Facilities by State on June 30, 1996

State	Functional Limitations: Needs Others' Assistance/Supervision in Walking	Needs Others' Assistance/Supervision with Dressing	Needs Others' Assistance/Supervision in Eating	Needs Others' Assistance/Supervision with Toileting	Cannot Communicate Desires Verbally
ALABAMA	28.6	58.0	35.7	47.9	53.7
ALASKA	*	*	*	*	*
ARIZONA	*	*	*	*	*
ARKANSAS	33.0	54.6	35.9	41.6	47.6
CALIFORNIA	49.6	82.0	53.9	84.3	68.6
COLORADO	52.7	75.7	75.7	71.4	71.4
CONNECTICUT	*	*	*	*	*
DELAWARE	35.1	80.4	59.4	79.4	61.2
D.C.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
FLORIDA	25.1	60.9	35.2	50.0	67.6
GEORGIA	54.8	69.4	65.2	59.7	66.9
HAWAII	55.1	64.3	59.2	53.1	61.2
IDAHO	53.7	59.4	46.3	45.5	58.5
ILLINOIS	27.9	64.1	36.9	44.1	70.0
INDIANA	25.1	46.3	26.5	47.7	52.6
IOWA	*	*	*	*	*
KANSAS	*	*	*	*	*
KENTUCKY	37.9	82.7	82.9	78.5	86.0
LOUISIANA	37.1	61.0	52.3	50.4	50.2
MAINE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MARYLAND	48.4	60.5	59.2	63.4	63.2
MASSACHUSETTS	51.1	81.4	75.1	58.3	64.6
MICHIGAN	35.9	58.5	48.9	54.0	42.9
MINNESOTA	35.3	72.6	64.3	63.7	71.5
MISSISSIPPI	43.4	71.9	48.8	58.0	59.7
MISSOURI	21.5	51.0	46.9	36.2	52.3
MONTANA	39.5	69.4	64.3	57.3	67.5
NEBRASKA	46.7	69.5	36.4	63.4	62.9
NEVADA	18.0	42.9	21.7	27.3	51.6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NEW JERSEY	33.0	51.3	38.9	33.4	53.5
NEW MEXICO	*	*	*	*	*
NEW YORK	30.4	63.2	56.6	64.7	40.9
NORTH CAROLINA	36.0	74.3	48.0	68.7	49.2
NORTH DAKOTA	50.7	76.3	76.4	68.3	71.6
OHIO	25.5	61.1	39.6	50.1	54.7
OKLAHOMA	22.7	56.6	58.9	44.8	52.9
OREGON	*	*	*	*	*
PENNSYLVANIA	34.7	70.4	58.7	51.1	54.4
RHODE ISLAND	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SOUTH CAROLINA	40.2	73.9	62.3	68.6	59.7
SOUTH DAKOTA	*	*	*	*	*
TENNESSEE	31.7	73.4	53.2	60.3	66.8
TEXAS	36.0	59.8	57.6	52.9	54.2
UTAH	54.3	68.9	56.9	54.0	68.2
VERMONT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
VIRGINIA	32.8	77.6	62.1	60.2	68.6
WASHINGTON	31.9	60.5	41.4	40.8	72.4
WEST VIRGINIA	68.0	86.6	80.0	72.0	85.3
WISCONSIN	54.4	64.9	85.8	79.0	82.7
WYOMING	*	*	*	*	*
U.S. Total	35.7	66.1	30.9	57.0	59.4

Note. Data in this table are based on the reports of large state facilities which housed 45,029 (77.2%) of the 58,320 large state facility residents on June 30, 1996. Specific state data are omitted (*) where the reported facilities in a specific state housed fewer than 60% of the total large state facility residents. NA is used to indicate states which did not operate large state facilities on June 30, 1996.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New Admissions by Age and Level of Mental Retardation

Table 1.20 presents the distribution of persons newly admitted to large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 by their age and level of mental retardation. Data reported in Table 1.16 were supplied by large state facilities housing 79.5% of large state facility residents, but with 83.8% reported admissions. As shown in Table 1.20 persons newly admitted to large state facilities in FY 1996 presented a considerably different profile than the general large state facility population on June 30, 1996. In general they were considerably younger and less severely cognitively impaired than the general population. For example, 1.2% of the total large state facility population was 0-14 years old as compared with 6.8% of the new admissions. While 3.8% of the general large state facility population was persons 15-21 years, 21.2% of new admissions were in this age group. In contrast, while persons 40 years or older made up half (50.4%) of the large state facility population, they made up only a quarter (25.2%) of the new admissions. Of course, the relatively higher proportion of young people in the new admission category as compared with general facility population reflects the fact that most people entering residential programs do so in adolescence or young adulthood. In general over the last decade between Fiscal Years 1986 and 1996 the proportion of children and youth among new admissions has not changed appreciably, decreasing from 32.7% to 28.0%. Similarly, newly admitted middle aged residents (40 years and older) have changed only slightly, increasing from 23.9% to 25.2% of all new admissions.

Newly admitted large state facility residents in Fiscal Year 1996 were also considerably more likely to have mild mental retardation or no mental retardation and considerably less likely to have profound mental retardation than was the case with the general large state facility population. Persons with mild or no mental retardation made up 31.1% of new admissions as compared with 7.4% of the general large state facility population. Higher proportions of persons with mild mental retardation among new admissions in 1996 (31.1% as compared to 27.7% in 1994) contributed to the increasing proportion of persons with mild mental retardation among general state institution populations (7.4% in 1996 as compared with 7.1% in 1994). Persons with profound mental retardation made up only 28.7% of new admissions as opposed to 65.9% of the total large state facility population (persons with profound mental retardation made up 34.3% of new admissions in Fiscal Year 1994). Children and young adults (birth to 39 years) with mild or no mental retardation made up over a quarter 25.7% of all new admissions as compared with 4.1% of the general large state facility population. As will be seen in Table 1.22 they also make up a disproportionately high proportion of discharges, indicating that large state facilities continue to function as relatively short-term entry and/or "crisis response" points for residential services for this population.

Table 1.20 New Admissions to Large State Facilities by Age and Level of Mental Retardation in the Year Ending June 30, 1996

Level of Retardation	Chronological Age 0-4	5-9	10-14	15-21	22-39	40-54	55-62	63+	Total(%)
Mild and No MR	0	3	10	127	232	66	7	6	451 (31.1%)
Moderate	0	4	20	67	188	57	10	3	349 (24.1%)
Severe	0	6	14	43	102	59	6	4	234 (16.1%)
Profound	9	14	19	70	157	104	21	22	416 (28.7%)
Total	9	27	63	307	679	286	44	35	1,450
%	0.6%	1.9%	4.3%	21.2%	46.8%	19.7%	3.0%	2.4%	100.0%

Note. New admissions in this table are persons admitted for the first time to individual large state facilities. This statistic reflects the number of persons who were admitted to a specific large state facility for the first time in Fiscal Year 1996. Statistics in this table represent 1,450 (83.8%) of the estimated 1,730 new admissions to individual large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996.

Readmissions by Age and Level of Mental Retardation

Table 1.21 presents the distribution of persons readmitted to specific large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 by their age and level of mental retardation. The large state facilities reporting data for Table 1.21 housed 79.5% of all residents of large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996, but had 83.8% of reported readmissions. The profile of readmissions shown in Table 1.21 is more similar to that of new admissions than of the general large state facility population, although as would be expected, it is slightly older than that of the new admissions (e.g., 29.0% as compared with 25.2% being 40 years or older). As with new admissions there was a relatively high proportion of persons with mild or no mental retardation (25.9% as compared with 7.4% in the general large state facility population) and a relatively low proportion of persons with profound mental retardation (33.9% as compared with 65.9% in the general large state facility population). There was virtually no change between 1989 and 1996 in the number and the proportion of persons with profound mental retardation among readmissions (33.7% of readmissions in 1989 and 33.9% in 1996). While readmissions were slightly older than new admissions, they tended to be younger than the general large state facility population (e.g., 31.4% vs. 5.1% were 21 years or younger; 2.4% vs. 7.7% were 63 years or older). The proportion of children and youth (0-21 years) among all readmissions has increased in recent years, from 19.0% in 1989 to 31.4% in 1996. But the estimated total number of children and youth readmitted to large state facilities decreased from an estimated 292 in 1989 to an estimated 253 in 1996, as total readmissions were substantially reduced.

Discharges by Age and Level of Mental Retardation

In the year ending June 30, 1996, there were an estimated 4,652 total discharges from large state facilities. About 5% of these "discharges" involved persons who were actually transferred to other large state facilities of 64 or more residents. Table 1.22 presents the distribution of persons discharged from large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996 by age and level of mental retardation. It is based on the reports of facilities with 78.9% of all discharges in Fiscal Year 1996. The age distribution of large state facility discharges was considerably more similar to the age distribution of the general large state facility population. Persons between the ages of 22 and 39 years made up 44.8% of discharges and 44.6% of the general large state facility population. Persons 55 years and older made up 14.9% of the general population and 11.1% of persons discharged. Just as the proportions of children and youth (0-21 years) among persons admitted to state institutions was substantially greater than their proportions in the general populations, so too was their rate of discharge (13.5% of discharges as compared to 5.1% of the general population). Although state institutions continue to admit substantial numbers of children and youth they appear to be generally quick to discharge them.

Table 1.21 Readmissions to Large State Facilities by Age and Level of Mental Retardation in the Year Ending June 30, 1996

Level of	Chronological Age								
Retardation	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-21	22-39	40-54	55-62	63+	Total(%)
Mild or No MR	0	0	1	27	94	41	7	5	175 (25.9%)
Moderate	0	4	4	22	68	47	6	5	756 (23.1%)
Severe	1	1	11	18	48	27	8	2	116 (17.2%)
Profound	11	26	30	56	58	38	6	4	229 (33.9%)
Total	12	31	46	123	268	153	27	16	676
%	1.8%	4.6%	6.8%	18.2%	39.6%	22.6%	4.0%	2.4%	(100.0%)

Note. Readmissions in the above Table 1.19 are persons readmitted to the particular large state facilities surveyed. This statistic reflects the number of persons who were readmitted to a specific large state facility in the state during Fiscal Year 1996. Statistics in Table 1.19 represent 676 (83.8%) of the estimated 807 readmissions to individual large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1.22 Discharges from Large State Facilities by Age and Level of Mental Retardation in the Year Ending June 30, 1996

Level of Retardation	Chronological Age 0-4	5-9	10-14	15-21	22-39	40-54	55-62	63+	Total(%)
Mild or No MR	1	2	2	87	335	140	23	17	607 (16.5%)
Moderate	2	8	11	56	239	154	30	28	528 (14.4%)
Severe	1	5	25	61	301	234	56	52	735 (20.0%)
Profound	14	32	50	136	769	600	128	73	1,802 (49.1%)
Total	18	47	88	340	1,644	1,128	237	170	3,672
%	0.5	1.3	2.4	9.3	44.8	30.7	6.5	4.6	100.0%

Note. Statistics in this table represent large state facilities with 78.9% of an estimated 4,652 discharges in Fiscal Year 1996.

With regard to levels of cognitive impairment persons discharged tended to fall in a range between that of persons being admitted during Fiscal Year 1996 and the general population of those same large state facilities. Persons with profound mental retardation made up 49.1% of discharges, 30.3% of combined new admissions and readmissions, and 65.9% of the general large state facility population. Persons with mild or no mental retardation made up 16.5% of discharges, 29.4% of combined new admissions and readmissions, and 7.4% of the general state institution population. Discharges outnumbered admissions for persons of all levels of mental retardation. It was notable, however, that the smallest relative difference between discharges and admissions was among persons with mild or no mental retardation, for whom estimated discharges (769) were only 2.7% more than estimated admissions (749). For persons with profound mental retardation estimated discharges (2,283) were three times the estimated 770 admissions.

Persons in Movement in 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996

Figure 1.8 compares the number and distribution by level of mental retardation of newly admitted, readmitted and released residents of individual large state facilities in Fiscal Years 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996. Admission patterns were generally similar in 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996, although there were steadily fewer persons in each of these categories, in large part because the June 30, 1996 population of large state facilities was 33.0% less than the 1989 population. In 1996 total new admissions and readmissions (2,537) were barely half (51.1%) of the number in 1989 (4,964). Discharges were 30.5% fewer in 1996 than in 1989. This general pattern of decreasing movement into and out of large state facilities has been evident for many years. For example, the combined new admissions and readmissions in 1996 were just 22.8% of the total in 1980 (11,141); discharges in 1996 (4,652) were just 34.2% of discharges in 1980 (13,622). Figure 1.8 also shows the level of mental retardation of persons in movement to be fairly consistent across movement categories (i.e., new admissions, readmissions and discharges) as well as between years (1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996).

For example in 1989, 27.8% of combined new admissions and readmissions had mild or no mental retardation as compared with 29.4% in 1996. In 1996 34.7% of admissions had profound mental retardation compared with 30.4% in 1996. Among discharges however, there has been a general tendency for persons with profound mental retardation to make up an increasing proportion, from 38.5% in 1989 and 39.4% in 1991 to 49.1% in 1996.

Figure 1.8
Distribution of Admissions and Discharges for Large State Facilities by Level of Mental Retardation in Fiscal Years 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996



Previous Placement of New Admissions

Table 1.23 summarizes the previous place of residence of persons admitted to specific large state facilities for the first time in Fiscal Year 1996. Statistics are provided for Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996. As was evident in each of years shown, a very frequent place of immediate prior residence for new admissions to one large state facility was another large state MR/DD facility (20.5% of 1996 new admissions). In 1996 combined new admissions from other large state MR/DD facilities and psychiatric facilities made up 40.7% of all new admissions. Since 1987 this proportion has remained in the range of 35% to 41% of all new admissions. A primary factor in the high number of persons moving into large facilities from other large facilities in recent years has been the large number of facility closures in progress or recently completed in the United States. But 1996's nearly equal proportion of newly admitted residents from MR/DD and psychiatric institutions (20.5% and 20.2% respectively) is notable and is reflected in the reported 31.0% of state institution residents having psychiatric disorders. In 1996 the proportion of new admissions coming directly from the family home increased slightly from 1994 (from 19.1% to 22.9%), but remained substantially below the proportions of a decade ago, 39.2% of new admissions in 1985 to 29.0% in 1987. A primary factor in this reduction has been the decrease in placements of children and youth in the large state facilities. Fiscal Year 1996 evidenced stabilization in what had been a steady increase in the proportions in community foster homes, group homes, or semi-independent and supported independent living settings. In 1985, 8.0% of new admissions came from such settings, increasing to 14.9% in 1989 and to 19.1% in 1994. The 1996 proportion was 18.2% of all person admitted for the first time. It should be noted, however, that the actual numbers of people admitted from these community residential arrangements decreased each year between 1989 and 1996 as total admissions decreased.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Previous Placement of Readmissions

Table 1.24 presents the previous place of residence of persons readmitted to state institutions from 1985 through 1996. Persons readmitted to large state facilities in 1996 most frequently came from community residential settings, including group homes with 15 or fewer residents (27.5%) and foster homes (8.3%). A notable trend between 1985 and 1991 had been the decrease in persons readmitted from their family home or the home of a relative (36.8% in 1985, 29.1% in 1987, 19.6% in 1989, 14.1% in 1991). In 1994 there was a substantial reversal of this trend with 26.7% of readmissions coming from the homes of parents or relatives. That reversal continued in 1996 with 29.7% of readmissions coming from the homes of parents or relatives. It is not clear why this is occurring, although it should be noted that the net change between 1991 and 1996 reflected only an estimated 42 more people being readmitted from their homes to state institutions nationwide.

Table 1.23 Previous Placement of Persons Newly Admitted to Large State Facilities in Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996

Previous Placement	Fiscal Year					
	1985	1987	1989	1991	1994	1996
Parents/relatives	39.2%	29.0%	28.5%	24.2%	19.1%	22.9%
Foster home	3.5	3.4	5.2	2.9	2.9	4.1
Group home (15 or fewer res.)	5.6	7.0	8.4	9.6	14.1	12.1
Group facility (16-63 res.)	3.5	4.2	4.0	3.0	3.1	4.3
Nonstate facility (64+ res.)	1.8	2.6	3.3	3.0	5.4	1.4
State facility (64+ res.)	20.6	27.9	18.5	25.7	23.1	20.5
Boarding home/board and care	0.5	0.7	1.7	3.1	0.6	0.2
Nursing facility	1.6	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.1	1.5
Semi-ind/independent living	1.0	0.8	1.3	1.7	2.1	2.0
Mental health facility	13.6	10.0	16.3	14.9	15.9	20.2
Correctional facility	2.3	2.7	3.0	4.2	4.3	3.9
Unknown/other	6.7	9.3	7.2	5.6	7.3	6.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. Statistics on previous placements for new admissions and readmissions in Fiscal Year 1996 are based on the reports of large state facilities reporting 86.4% of all new admissions (1,494 of 1,730 new admissions).

Table 1.24 Previous Placement of Persons Readmitted to Large State Facilities, Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996

Previous Placement	Year					
	1985	1987	1989	1991	1994	1996
Parents/relatives	36.8%	29.1%	19.6%	14.1%	26.7%	29.7%
Foster home	7.1	7.5	9.3	10.1	5.4	8.3
Group home (15 or fewer res.)	19.7	17.9	22.9	26.1	30.1	27.5
Group facility (16-63 res.)	4.1	3.9	2.4	4.6	5.1	8.3
Nonstate facility (64+ res.)	2.5	3.8	2.9	6.6	1.8	0.7
State facility (64+ res.)	7.4	14.6	13.5	12.1	8.7	6.3
Boarding home/board and care	1.2	0.4	0.9	2.5	0.6	0.2
Nursing facility	2.0	2.4	3.1	2.4	1.8	1.1
Semi-ind/independent living	0.6	0.9	1.3	2.9	2.5	6.6
Mental health facility	8.5	8.4	12.8	9.5	8.1	4.5
Correctional facility	1.7	1.5	0.9	2.1	3.1	2.0
Unknown/other	7.9	8.9	10.4	7.2	9.4	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. Statistics on previous placements for readmissions and readmissions in Fiscal Year 1996 are based on the reports of large state facilities reporting 88.5% of all readmissions (714 of 807 readmissions).

New Residence of Discharged Residents

Table 1.25 shows the new place of residence of people leaving large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1996, and, for comparative purposes, in Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991 and 1994 as well. In 1996 well over half (57.5%) of all persons released from large state facilities whose subsequent placement was reported (i.e., excluding unknown/other) went to live in group homes of 15 or fewer residents. Another 18.0% of released residents whose placement was known went to natural, adoptive or foster homes. There was a slight increase in 1996 in the percentage of released residents moving to their parents' or relatives' homes (from 7.2% in 1991 to 9.2% in 1994 to 9.8% in 1996), but the proportion was still considerably below the 17.1% in 1985 and 12.4% in 1989. Post discharge placement patterns were fairly stable between 1985 and 1996. The most notable change was the proportional increase in group home placements (from 40.4% in 1985 to 48.8% in 1989 to 53.2% in 1991 to 55.1% in 1996 in statistics unadjusted for "unknown/other."), although in actual numbers, discharges to community group homes decreased from an estimated 3,269 in 1989 to 3,081 in 1994 to 2,563 in 1996. Nursing home placements (2.7% of discharges in 1996) were substantially less than the 4.4% of all discharges in 1987, the year in which the OBRA nursing home reforms were enacted (see Chapter 8 for a description). But the 1996 proportions, like those of 1994, were slight increases from the 2.0% rate reported in 1989 and 1991, reflecting perhaps the aging of state institution populations noted earlier.

Table 1.25 New Place of Residence of Persons Discharged from Large State Facilities, Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1994 and 1996

	Fiscal Year					
New Place of Residence	1985	1987	1989	1991	1994	1996
Home of parents or relative	17.1%	11.3%	12.4%	7.2%	9.2%	9.8%
Foster home	7.1	7.0	7.4	6.5	8.6	7.5
Group home (15 or fewer res.)	40.4	46.6	48.8	53.2	55.6	55.1
Group facility (16-63 res.)	7.4	6.7	5.3	7.5	4.3	4.2
Nonstate facility (64+ res.)	3.8	3.6	2.6	4.0	2.4	1.1
State facility (64+ res.)	10.1	12.2	10.2	9.3	8.8	4.8
Boarding home/Board and care	3.2	0.9	2.3	3.6	1.4	3.7
Nursing facility	4.1	4.4	2.0	2.0	2.6	2.7
Semi-Ind./Ind. Supported living	1.4	4.9	1.9	1.6	4.6	5.6
Mental health facility	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.9	0.9	0.6
Correctional facility	0.2	0.5	1.3	1.0	0.4	0.7
Unknown/Other	3.7	0.7	4.3	2.3	5.8	4.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note. Statistics on new place of residence are for persons leaving a specific large state facility and, therefore, include transfers between large state facilities. These statistics include subsequent residence of 3,791 (81.5%) of 4,652 persons discharged from individual large state facilities in Fiscal Year 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION II

STATUS AND CHANGES IN TOTAL STATE RESIDENTIAL SERVICE SYSTEMS

CHAPTER 5
SERVICES PROVIDED BY STATE AND NONSTATE AGENCIES IN 1996

Lynda Anderson
Barbara Polister
Robert Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin

This chapter provides statistics on all residential services that were directly provided or licensed by states for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD). These statistics are reported by state, operator (state or nonstate agency) and residential setting size as of June 30, 1996. Residential services data for 1996 are compared with similar statistics from 1977, 1982, 1987, and 1992. The statistics in this chapter do not include psychiatric facilities or nursing homes, but do include services financed under the federal Medicaid program, most notably the Intermediate Care Facilities for Persons with Mental Retardation (ICFs-MR) and Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) programs. Statistics on psychiatric facility residents with MR/DD are reported in Chapter 1 and statistics on nursing home residents with MR/DD are reported in Chapter 8. They are excluded here because of this chapter's focus on services provided within the designated MR/DD service systems of each state.

Number of Residential Settings

Table 2.1 presents statistics by state, operator, and size on the number of individual residential settings in which people received state licensed or state provided residential services for persons with MR/DD on June 30, 1996. It excludes services provided to people living with their natural or adoptive families.

There were 86,225 distinct residential settings in which persons with MR/DD who were receiving residential services on June 30, 1996. Of the total 86,225 residential settings, 84,378 (97.9%) were served by nonstate agencies or individuals and 1,847 (2.1%) were state-operated. In all, 78,365 (90.9%) settings had 6 or fewer residents, 6,287 (7.3%) had 7 to 15 residents and 1,491 (1.7%) had 16 or more residents. Virtually all residential settings with 6 or fewer residents were operated by nonstate agencies (98.8%), as were most of those with 7 to 15 persons (89.1%) and with 16 or more residents (83.1%).

Number of Persons Receiving Residential Services

Table 2.2 presents statistics by state, operator, and setting size on the number of people with MR/DD receiving residential services on June 30, 1996. It excludes services provided to persons with MR/DD living with their natural or adoptive families. On June 30, 1996 states reported a total of 324,567 persons with developmental disabilities were receiving residential services. Of these, 255,288 (78.7%) were served by nonstate agencies. Virtually all persons in settings with 6 or fewer residents (97.8%) and an overwhelming majority of those in settings with 7 to 15 residents (88.0%) received services from nonstate agencies. In contrast, over three-fifths (61.2%) of all persons in facilities with 16 or more residents were served by state agencies, even though 83.1% of facilities with 16 or more residents were operated by nonstate agencies. California and New York had by far the largest numbers of persons receiving residential services (43,878 and 34,316, respectively). California, Texas, and Illinois had the largest number of persons living in facilities of 16 or more residents (9,147, 8,057, and 7,219 respectively). California had the largest number of persons living in large nonstate facilities (4,566 or 12.3% of the national total). California and New York had the largest number of persons living in nonstate residential settings of 15 or fewer persons (34,731 and 22,431 respectively). California, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania had the largest number of persons living in nonstate residential settings of 6 or fewer persons (31,804, 11,557, and 10,012 and 9,827, respectively).

Table 2.1 Residential Settings for Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Served by State and Nonstate Agencies on June 30, 1996

State	Nonstate Residential Facilities							State Residential Facilities							Total Facilities						
	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL**	231	59	290	96	386	6	399	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	231	59	290	98	386	11	404
AK	DNF	DNF	311 e	6 e	317	0	317	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	DNF	DNF	311	6	317	1	318
AZ	465	333	798	1	799	3	802	3	17	22	8	30	1	31	470	350	820	9	829	4	833
AR	472 a	7 a	479 a	84	563	11 a	574	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	472	7	479	84	563	17	580
CA	DNF	DNF	14,692	601 e	15,293	300 e	15,593	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	DNF	DNF	14,692	601	15,293	307	15,600
CO	2,313 e	121 e	2,434 e	40 e	2,474	1	2,475	2	0	2	36	38	2	40	2,313	121	2,434	76	2,512	3	2,515
CT	1,687	327	2,014	14	2,028	0	2,028	73	48	123	37	160	11	171	1,762	375	2,137	51	2,188	11	2,199
DE	130	35	165	2	167	0	167	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	130	35	165	2	167	1	168
DC	63	125	188	62	250	0	250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	125	188	62	250	0	250
FL	2,054 e	515	2,569 e	177	2,746	70	2,816	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	2,054	515	2,569	177	2,746	78	2,824
GA	DNF	DNF	721 b	0	721	9 a	730	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	DNF	DNF	721	0	721	17	738
HI	324	222	546	1	547	12	559	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	324	222	546	1	547	13	560
ID	815 e	18 e	833 e	79 e	912	12 e	924	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	815	18	833	79	912	13	925
IL	539	200	739	268	1,007	49	1,056	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	539	200	739	268	1,007	60	1,067
IN	1,306 ,a	206 a	1,512 a,e	356	1,868	14	1,882	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	1,306	206	1,512	356	1,868	21	1,889
IA	27 e	1,330 e	1,357 e	220 e	1,577	215 e	1,867	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	27	1,330	1,357	220	1,577	217	1,869
KS	32	83	115	98	213	13	226	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	32	83	115	98	213	16	229
KY	482	2	484	29	513	7	520	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	482	2	484	29	513	10	523
LA	554 e	395	964 e	126 e	1,090	16 e	1,106	0	13	13	0	13	9	22	554	408	977	126	1,103	25	1,128
ME	DNF	DNF	423 a	30 a	453	6 a	459	0	0	0	4	4	1	5	DNF	DNF	423	34	457	7	464
MD	1,755	229	1,984 e	51	2,035	4	2,039	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	1,755	229	1,984	51	2,035	9	2,044
MA	1,490 ,c	608 e,c	2,736 e,c	102	2,838	0	2,838	0	71	71	61	132	7	139	1,490	679	2,807	163	2,970	7	2,977
MI	736 e	1,678 e	2,897 e	0	2,897	0	2,897	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	736	1,678	2,897	0	2,897	3	2,900
MN	2,587 e	690 e	3,277 e	151 e	3,428	34	3,462	0	47	47	0	47	5	52	2,587	737	3,324	151	3,475	39	3,514
MS	123	8	131	6	137	5	142	63	32	95	23	118	5	123	186	40	226	29	255	10	265
MO	937 e	140	1,077 e	156	1,233	78	1,311	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	937	140	1,077	156	1,233	84	1,317
MT	613 e	37	650 e	63	713	0	713	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	613	37	650	63	713	2	715
NE***	484 e	131 e	615 e	32 e	647	2	649	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	484	131	615	32	647	3	650
NV	208	39	247	1	248	4	252	0	1	1	1	2	2	4	208	40	248	2	250	6	256
NH	877	35	1,167	7	1,174	1	1,175	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	879	35	1,169	7	1,176	1	1,177
NJ	1,258	491	1,749	70	1,819	39	1,858	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	1,258	491	1,749	70	1,819	47	1,866
NM	DNF	DNF	1,311 e	19	1,330	5	1,335	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	DNF	DNF	1,311	19	1,330	6	1,336
NY	4,006 e	971 e	4,977 e	1,224	6,201	47	6,248	90	344	434	501	935	45	980	4,096	1,315	5,411	1,725	7,136	92	7,228
NC	380	506	886	59	945	14	959	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	380	506	886	59	945	19	964
ND	916 e	34	950 e	61	1,011	4	1,015	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	916	34	950	61	1,011	5	1,016
OH	DNF	DNF	3,795 e	313	4,108	86	4,194	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	DNF	DNF	3,795	313	4,108	98	4,206
OK	DNF	DNF	890 a	24 a	914	27 a	941	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	DNF	DNF	890	24	914	30	944
OR	727 e	316	1,413 e	71 e	1,484	5 e	1,489	2	7	9	0	9	2	11	729	323	1,422	71	1,493	7	1,500
PA	4,308	695	5,003	96	5,097	45	5,142	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4,308	695	5,003	94	5,097	56	5,153
RI	135 e	115	250 e	22	272	0	272	0	35	35	13	48	0	48	135	150	285	35	320	0	320
SC	554	69	623	135	558	3	561	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	362	69	431	135	566	8	574
SD	536 e	4	538 e	65	623	0	623	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	554	4	558	65	623	1	624
TN	469	66	535	183	718	3	721	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	469	66	535	183	718	8	726
TX	0	705	705	78	783	28	811	0	46	46	3	49	13	62	0	751	751	81	832	41	873
UT	700 e	23	723 e	36 e	757	12	769	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	700	23	723	36	757	13	770
VT	654	19	673	0	673	0	673	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	654	19	673	0	673	0	673
VA*	57 e	67	124 e	51	175	0	175	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	57	67	124	51	175	5	180
WA	1,622 e	39	1,661 e	42	1,703	9	1,712	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	1,622	39	1,661	42	1,703	14	1,717
WV	594	57	651	84	735	3	738	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	594	57	651	84	735	4	739
WI	3,135	310	3,445	102	3,547	37	3,584	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3,135	310	3,445	102	3,547	40	3,587
WY	267	53	320	10	330	0	330	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	267	53	320	10	330	1	331
U S	40,935	12,157	77,457	3,600	81,057	1,239	84,378	247	681	908	687	1,595	252	1,847	41,182	12,918	78,365	6,287	84,652	1,491	86,225

a indicates 1995 data b indicates 1994 data c size of residence was estimated for 1235 recipients of individual community supports based on size of residences for other community residences

e indicates estimate DNF indicates data not furnished

* includes 1995 Non-state ICF/MR data, and estimates of settings based on waiver recipients and does not include people receiving non-medicaid services

** total includes 18 facilities of unknown size # total includes 75 settings of unknown size

*** based on survey of 5/6 regions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.3 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Served by State and Nonstate Agencies on June 30, 1996

State	Residents of All Nonstate Settings by Size							Residents of All State Settings by Size							Residents of All Settings by Size						
	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total#
AL***	609	243	852	712	1,564	31	1,595	0	0	0	0	0	900	900	609	243	852	712	1,564	931	2,395
AK	156	336	492 c	73 c	565	0	565	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	156	336	492	73	565	19	584
AZ	908	1,595	2,503	14	2,517	83	2,600	15	85	100	94	194	103	297	923	1,680	2,603	108	2,711	186	2,697
AR	353	150 c	503 c	823 a,c	1,326	224 a	1,550	0	0	0	0	0	1,272	1,272	353	139	312 c	823 a	1,335 a	1,496 a	2,832
CA	9,845	21,959	31,804	2,927	34,731	4,566	39,297	0	0	0	0	0	4,581	4,581	9,845	21,959	31,804	2,927	34,731	9,147	43,878
CO	2,340 c	585 c	2,925 c	299 c	3,224	36 c	3,260	4	0	4	294	298	197	495	2,344	585	2,929	593	3,522	233	3,755
CT	2,005	1,693	5,098	116	3,814	0	3,814	198	258	456	284	740	1,209	1,949	2,203	1,951	4,154	400	4,554	1,209	5,763
DE	259	162	421	16	437	0	437	0	0	0	15	15	291	306	259	162	421	31	452	291	743
DC	119	372	491	374	1,065	0	1,065	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	372	491	374	1,065	0	1,065
FL	1,912	2,627	4,539	1,572	6,111	2,418	8,529	0	0	0	0	0	1,459	1,459	1,912	2,627	4,539	1,572	6,111	3,877	9,988
GA	DNF	DNF	1,538 b	0	1,538 b	110 b	1,648	0	0	0	0	0	1,909	1,909	DNF	DNF	1,538	0	1,538	2,019	3,557
HI	560	510	1,070	7	1,077	14	1,091	0	0	0	0	0	49	49	560	510	1,070	7	1,077	63	1,140
ID	1,099	109	1,208 c	321 c	1,729 c	319 c	2,048	0	0	0	0	0	123	123	1,033	153	1,208	321	1,729	442	2,171
IL	1,544	872	2,416	3,442	5,858	3,501	9,359	0	0	0	0	0	3,718	3,718	1,544	872	2,416	3,442	5,858	7,219	13,077
IN	1,544	1,012	2,556 a,c	2,820 c	5,376	984 c	6,360	0	0	0	0	0	1,244	1,244	1,544	1,012	2,556	2,820	5,376	2,228	7,604
IA	1,158	1,673	2,831 c	1,994 c	4,825 c	2,551 c	7,376	0	0	0	0	0	672	672	1,158	1,673	2,831	1,994	4,825	3,223	8,048
KS	80	466	546	831	1,377	730	2,107	0	0	0	0	0	676	676	80	466	546	831	1,377	1,406	2,783
KY	995	7	1,002	234	1,236	529 c	1,765	0	0	0	0	0	644	644	995	7	1,002	234	1,236	1,173	2,409
LA	670 c	2,428 c	3,098 c	1,187 c	4,285 c	1,617 c	5,902	0	78	78	0	78	2,031	2,109	669	2,507	3,176 c	1,187 c	4,363 c	3,648 c	8,011
ME	105	983	1,088 a	262 a	1,350 a	150 a	1,400	0	0	0	48	48	19	67	105	983	1,088 a	310 a	1,398 a	149 a	1,547
MD	2,999	849	3,848	353	4,201	74	4,275	0	0	0	0	0	652	652	2,999	849	3,848	353	4,201	726	4,927
MA	3,187 a,c	2,626 a,c	5,813 a,c	876	6,689	0	6,689	0	280	280	488	768	1,824	2,592	3,187	3,506	6,093	1,364	7,457	1,824	9,281
MI	2,816	8,741	11,557	0	11,557	0	11,557	0	0	0	0	0	346	346	2,816	8,741	11,557	0	11,557	346	11,903
MN	4,709 c	2,965 c	7,674 c	1,674 c	9,348 c	1,075	10,423	0	222	222	0	222	345	567	4,709	3,187	7,896 c	1,674 c	9,570 c	1,420	10,990
MS	145	52	197	67	264	625	889	101	169	270	225	495	1,424	1,919	246	221	467	292	759	2,049	2,808
MO	2,261	723	2,984	1,315	4,299	725	5,024	0	0	0	0	0	1,494	1,494	2,261	723	2,984	1,315	4,299	2,219	6,518
MT	640	199	839	501	1,340	0	1,340	0	0	0	0	0	157	157	640	199	839	501	1,340	157	1,497
NE**	869	584	1,453 c	240 c	1,693 c	240 c	1,933	0	0	0	0	0	401	401	869	584	1,453	240	1,693	641	2,334
NV	272	198	470	7	477	4	481	0	6	6	12	18	154	172	272	204	476	19	495	158	653
NH	1,343	158	1,501	58	1,559	22	1,581	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	1,347	158	1,505	58	1,563	22	1,585
NJ	2,127	2,378	4,505	533	5,038	690	5,728	0	0	0	0	0	4,241	4,241	2,127	2,378	4,505	533	5,038	4,931	9,969
NM	1,475	127	1,602 c	181 c	1,783	110 c	1,893	0	0	0	0	0	145	145	1,475	127	1,602	181	1,783	255	2,038
NY	6,475 c	3,539 c	10,012 c	12,419	22,431	1,409	23,840	242	1,692	1,934	5,143	7,077	3,399	10,476	6,715	5,231	11,946	17,562	29,508	4,808	34,316
NC	650	2,996	3,646	751	4,397	559	4,956	0	0	0	0	0	2,227	2,227	650	2,996	3,646	751	4,397	2,786	7,183
ND	924	198	1,122	503	1,625	114	1,739	0	0	0	0	0	148	148	924	198	1,122	503	1,625	262	1,887
OH	DNF	DNF	6,619 c	3,099	9,718	3,686	13,404	0	0	0	0	0	2,087	2,087	DNF	DNF	6,619 c	3,099	9,718	5,773	15,491
OK	DNF	DNF	1,523 a	263 a	1,786 a	1,684 a	3,470	0	0	0	0	0	553	553	DNF	DNF	1,523 a	263 a	1,786 a	2,237 a	4,023
OR	647	2,033	2,680 c	561 c	3,241 c	192 c	3,433	3	35	38	0	38	429	467	650	2,068	2,718	561	3,279	621	3,900
PA	180	9,647	9,827	728	10,555	2,385	12,940	0	0	0	0	0	3,164	3,164	180	9,647	9,827	728	10,555	5,549	16,104
RI	180 c	594	774 c	187	961	0	961	0	204	204	150	354	0	354	180	798	978	337	1,315	0	1,315
SC	1,376	252	1,628	1,087	2,715	78	2,793	22	0	22	0	22	1,548	1,570	1,398	252	1,650	1,087	2,737	1,626	4,363
SD	967	22	989	684	1,673	0	1,673	0	0	0	0	0	252	252	967	22	989	684	1,673	252	1,925
TN	904	312	1,216	1,461	2,677	144	2,821	0	0	0	0	0	1,388	1,388	904	312	1,216	1,461	2,677	1,532	4,209
TX	0	4012	4,012	869	4,881	2,322	7,203	0	251	251	35	286	5,735	6,021	DNF	DNF	4,263	904	5,167	8,057	13,224
UT	1,126 c	115 c	1,241 c	276 c	1,517 c	543	2,060	0	0	0	0	0	311	311	1,126	115	1,241	276	1,517	854	2,371
VT	193	659	852	0	852	0	852	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	659	852	0	852	0	852
VA*	73 c	398 c	471 c	713 c	1,184	0	1,184	0	0	0	0	0	2,189	2,189	73	398	471	713	1,184	2,189	3,373
WA	4,229	213	4,442	400	4,842	223	5,065	0	0	0	0	0	1,281	1,281	4,229	213	4,442	400	4,842	1,304	6,346
WV	815	307	1,122	666	1,788	99	1,887	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	815	307	1,122	666	1,788	174	1,962
WI	6,372	1,500	7,872	830	8,702	2,170	10,872	0	0	0	0	0	1,197	1,197	6,372	1,500	7,872	830	8,702	3,367	12,069
WY	344	255	599	75	674	0	674	0	0	0	0	0	145	145	253	0	599	73	674	145	819
U.S.	74,557	84,434	168,671	49,601	218,272	37,016	255,288	389	3,280	3,869	6,773	10,642	58,340	69,962	75,146	83,942	172,549	56,389	228,938 0	95,336	324,567

a indicates 1995 data b indicates 1994 data e indicates estimate

c size of residence was estimated for 1253 recipients of individual community supports based on size of residences for other community residences

* indicates 1995 ICF/MR data, other numbers based on estimates from waiver recipient numbers and does not include people receiving non-medicaid services.

** data estimated from reports from 5/6 regions *** total includes 167 people living in settings of unknown size

#The total of this table does not equal the sums of congregate care, foster care and own home due to approximately 3% of service recipients living in settings of unknown size.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Relative Size of Residential Settings

Table 2.3 presents statistics summarizing the Relative size of the residential settings for persons with MR/DD across the states. It shows the extreme variability among states on three measures of relative size of residential settings.

Average residential settings size. On June 30, 1996 an average of 3.8 persons with MR/DD lived in each setting in which residential services were provided in the United States. The average number of persons with MR/DD per residential setting ranged from more than 10 in five states to less than 3 in sixteen states. Twenty-three states were at or over the national average. Figure 2.1 shows changes in average number of residents with MR/DD per residential setting between 1977 and 1996. It indicates that the average number of residents per setting continues to decrease steadily, at a somewhat slower rate than was evident from 1977 through 1987.

Percentage living in small residential settings. Table 2.3 shows the percentage of all persons reported to be receiving residential services in each state on June 30, 1996 who were living in residential settings with 15 or fewer residents and with 6 or fewer residents, and with 3 or fewer residents. Nationally, 70.5% of residents lived in settings with 15 or fewer residents. In over half of the states (39), 60% or more of all residential service recipients lived in places with 15 or fewer residents, while in three states less than 40% of residential service recipients lived in places with 15 or fewer residents. Nationally, on June 30, 1996 53.2% of residents lived in settings with 6 or fewer residents, and an estimated 24.9% lived in settings with 1-3 residents. In 23 states more than 60% of all persons receiving residential services lived in settings with 6 or fewer residents, while in eight states less than one-third of all residential service recipients lived in settings of 6 or fewer residents. (Figure 2.2 shows these variations on a state-by-state basis).

Figure 2.1
Average Number of Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities per Residential Setting on June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1995 and 1996



Figure 2.2 Percentage of All Residential Service Recipients in Settings with 6 or fewer on June 30, 1996



National Average = 53.2%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.3 Summary Statistics on the Size of Residential Settings for Persons with MR/DD on June 30, 1996

State	All Settings	All Residents	Average Residents/ Settings	% in Settings with 1-15	% in Settings with 1-6	% in Settings with 1-3
AL	404	2395	5.9	65.3%	35.6%	25.4%
AK	318	584	1.8	96.7%	84.2%	26.7%
AZ	833	2,697	3.2	93.1%	89.1%	37.9%
AR	580	2,822	4.9	47.3%	18.1%	12.5%
CA	15,600	43,878	2.8	79.2%	72.5%	22.4%
CO	2,515	3,755	1.5	93.8%	78.0%	62.3%
CT	2,199	5,763	2.6	79.0%	72.1%	38.2%
DE	168	743	4.4	60.8%	56.7%	34.9%
DC	250	1,065	4.3	100.0%	64.9%	11.2%
FL	2,824	9,988	3.5	61.2%	45.4%	19.1%
GA	738	3,557	4.8	43.2%	43.2%	DNF
HI	560	1,140	2.0	94.5%	93.9%	49.1%
ID	925	2,171	2.3	79.6%	55.6%	48.5%
IL	1,067	13,077	12.3	44.8%	18.5%	11.8%
IN	1,889	7,604	4.0	70.7%	33.6%	20.3%
IA	1,869	8,048	4.3	60.0%	35.2%	14.4%
KS	229	2,783	12.2	49.5%	19.6%	2.9%
KY	523	2,409	4.6	51.3%	41.6%	41.3%
LA	1,128	8,011	7.1	54.5%	39.6%	8.4%
ME	464	1,547	3.3	90.4%	70.3%	6.8%
MD	2,044	4,927	2.4	85.3%	78.1%	60.9%
MA	2,977	9,281	3.1	80.3%	65.7%	26.9%
MI	2,900	11,903	4.1	97.1%	97.1%	23.7%
MN	3,514	10,990	3.1	87.1%	71.8%	42.8%
MS	265	2,808	10.6	27.0%	16.6%	8.8%
MO	1,317	6,518	4.9	66.0%	45.8%	34.7%
MT	715	1,497	2.1	89.5%	56.0%	42.8%
NE	650	2,334	3.6	72.5%	62.3%	37.2%
NV	256	653	2.6	75.8%	72.9%	41.7%
NH	1,177	1,585	1.3	98.6%	95.0%	85.0%
NJ	1,866	9,969	5.3	50.5%	45.2%	21.3%
NM	1,336	2,038	1.5	87.5%	78.6%	72.4%
NY	7,228	34,316	4.7	86.0%	34.8%	19.6%
NC	964	7,183	7.5	61.2%	50.8%	9.0%
ND	1,016	1,887	1.9	86.1%	59.5%	49.0%
OH	4,206	15,491	3.7	62.7%	42.7%	DNF
OK	944	4,023	4.3	44.4%	37.9%	DNF
OR	1,500	3,900	2.6	84.1%	69.7%	16.7%
PA	5,153	16,104	3.1	65.5%	61.0%	1.1%
RI	320	1,315	4.1	100.0%	74.4%	13.7%
SC	574	4,363	7.6	62.7%	37.8%	32.0%
SD	624	1,925	3.1	86.9%	51.4%	50.2%
TN	726	4,209	5.8	63.6%	28.9%	21.5%
TX	873	13,224	15.1	39.1%	32.2%	DNF
UT	770	2,371	3.1	64.0%	52.3%	47.5%
VT	673	852	1.3	100.0%	100.0%	22.7%
VA	180	3,373	18.7	35.1%	14.0%	2.2%
WA	1,717	6,346	3.7	76.3%	70.0%	66.6%
WV	739	1,962	2.7	91.1%	57.2%	41.5%
WI	3,587	12,069	3.4	72.1%	65.2%	52.8%
WY	331	819	2.5	82.3%	73.1%	42.0%
U.S. Total	86,225	324,567	3.8	70.5%	53.2%	23.2%

Number of Residential Service Recipients Per 100,000 General Population

Figure 2.3 and Table 2.4 present statistics on the number of persons with MR/DD receiving residential services per 100,000 of each state's general population on June 30, 1996. On June 30, 1996 there were a reported 122.0 persons with MR/DD receiving residential services per 100,000 of the U.S. population. Nevada had the lowest overall residential placement rate per 100,000 state citizens (43.0). North Dakota had the highest overall placement rate with 295.8 persons receiving residential services per 100,000 of the state population. In all, 24 states reported placement rates below the national average, with four states (Alabama, Georgia, Nevada and Virginia) reporting rates less than 50% of the national average. Of the 27 states above the national average, eight (District of Columbia, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) were more than 150% above the national average. Three states, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota were more than 200% above the national average. While states varied substantially in the number of persons with MR/DD receiving residential services per 100,000 of the state's population, most states (30) fell within the range of the national average plus or minus one-third.

On June 30, 1996 there were 86.1 persons receiving residential services in settings with 15 or fewer residents per 100,000 of the U.S. population. A total of 14 states had placement rates that were more than 150% of this national average. Four states reported rates more than twice the national average (District of Columbia, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota). The national average placement rate for settings with 6 or fewer residents was 64.9 residents per 100,000 of the general population. Six states reported rates equal to or more than twice the national average (Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wisconsin). The national placement rate for facilities of 16 or more residents was 35.8 residents per 100,000 of the national population. Three states (Iowa, Louisiana and Mississippi) reported a rate more than twice the national average. Figure 2.3 shows the geographic variation among states in their number of persons receiving residential services per 100,000 of the general population.

Table 2.4 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Receiving Residential Services per 100,000 of State General Population by Size of Residential Setting, June 30, 1996

	State Population	Number of Residents in Residential Setting				
State	(100,000)	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL	43.16	19.7	16.5	36.2	19.3	55.5
AK	6.47	76.0	11.3	87.3	2.9	90.3
AZ	41.45	58.0	2.6	60.6	4.5	65.1
AR	24.90	20.2	33.1	53.3	60.1	113.3
CA	328.96	96.7	8.9	105.6	27.8	133.4
CO	37.80	77.5	15.7	93.2	6.2	99.3
CT	32.73	126.9	12.2	139.1	36.9	176.1
DE	7.26	58.0	4.3	62.3	40.1	102.3
DC	5.55	124.5	67.4	191.9	0.0	191.9
FL	144.31	31.5	10.9	42.3	26.9	69.2
GA	72.09	21.3	0.0	21.3	28.0	49.3
HI	12.42	86.2	0.6	86.7	5.1	91.8
ID	11.83	102.1	44.0	146.2	37.4	183.5
IL	119.16	20.3	28.9	49.2	60.6	109.7
IN	58.65	43.6	48.1	91.7	38.0	129.7
IA	28.75	98.5	69.4	167.8	112.1	279.9
KS	26.25	20.8	31.7	52.5	53.6	106.0
KY	38.79	25.8	6.0	31.9	30.2	62.1
LA	43.83	72.5	27.1	99.5	83.2	182.8
ME	12.37	88.0	25.1	113.0	12.0	125.1
MD	51.27	75.1	6.9	81.9	14.2	96.1
MA	59.71	102.0	22.8	124.9	30.5	155.4
MI	96.12	120.2	0.0	120.2	3.6	123.8
MN	46.60	169.4	35.9	205.4	30.5	235.8
MS	26.83	17.4	10.9	28.3	76.4	104.7
MO	53.16	56.1	24.7	80.9	41.7	122.6
MT	8.74	96.0	57.3	153.3	18.0	171.3
NE	16.56	87.7	14.5	102.2	38.7	140.9
NV	15.20	31.3	1.3	32.6	10.4	43.0
NH	11.39	132.1	5.1	137.2	1.9	139.2
NJ	79.72	56.5	6.7	63.2	61.9	125.1
NM	17.05	94.0	10.6	104.6	15.0	119.5
NY	181.90	65.7	96.5	162.2	26.4	188.7
NC	72.43	50.3	10.4	60.7	38.5	99.2
ND	6.38	175.9	78.8	254.7	41.1	295.8
OH	112.53	58.8	27.5	86.4	51.3	137.7
OK	32.93	46.2	8.0	54.2	67.9	122.2
OR	31.94	85.1	17.6	102.7	19.4	122.1
PA	121.66	80.8	6.0	86.8	45.6	132.4
RI	10.00	97.8	33.7	131.5	0.0	131.5
SC	37.72	43.7	28.8	72.6	43.1	115.7
SD	7.42	133.3	92.2	225.5	34.0	259.4
TN	52.90	23.0	27.6	50.6	29.0	79.6
TX	188.81	22.6	4.8	27.4	42.7	70.0
UT	19.85	62.5	13.9	76.4	43.0	119.4
VT	5.82	146.4	0.0	146.4	0.0	146.4
VA	67.26	7.0	10.6	17.6	32.5	50.1
WA	56.12	79.2	7.1	86.3	26.8	113.1
WV	18.27	61.4	36.5	97.9	9.5	107.4
WI	52.03	151.3	16.0	167.2	64.7	232.0
WY	4.94	121.3	15.2	136.4	29.4	165.8
U. S. Total	2,659.99	64.9	21.2	86.1	35.8	122.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 2.3 Residential Service Recipients per 100,000 of State General Population in 1996



86

87

National Average = 122.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Persons Presently Not Receiving Residential Services on Waiting Lists for Residential Services

Table 2.5 summarizes statistics reported by states on the actual or estimated number of people with mental retardation and related conditions not receiving residential services who are on waiting lists for such services on June 30, 1996. These statistics are presented as raw numbers and as percentages of the total number of all persons receiving and waiting for services. As shown, 37 states provided statistics on the number of persons waiting for residential services on June 30, 1996. Among these states a total of 51,553 persons were reported to be waiting for services. Assuming the same ratio of persons waiting for residential services to persons receiving residential services in non-reporting states (were not able to report waiting list data) as in reporting states, on June 30, 1996, an estimated national total of 87,107 persons with mental retardation and related conditions were waiting for residential services. A 26.9% growth in the number of persons served would be required to eliminate the waiting lists nationally. While two states (Arizona and North Dakota) reported having no persons with mental retardation and related conditions waiting for residential services, 17 states reported waiting lists of such length that their residential services programs would need to be expanded by more than one-quarter to accommodate presently identified needs.

Table 2.5 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities who Were on Waiting List for, But Not Receiving Residential Services on June 30, 1996.

State	Total Persons on Waiting List		Total Residential Service Recipients	% Growth Needed to Match Needs
AL	1,171		2,395	48.9%
AK	318	e	584	54.5%
AZ	0		2,697	0.0%
AR	DNF		2822	DNF
CA	DNF		43878	DNF
CO	2,318		3,755	61.7%
CT	1,281		5,763	21.9%
DE	479		743	64.5%
DC	87		1,065	8.2%
FL	1,951		9,988	19.5%
GA	1,644		3,557	46.2%
HI	776		1,140	68.1%
ID	100	e	2,171	4.6%
IL	DNF		13077	DNF
IN	2,067		7,604	27.2%
IA	DNF		8048	DNF
KS	16		2,783	0.6%
KY	DNF		2409	DNF
LA	2,254		8,011	28.1%
ME	DNF		1547	DNF
MD	DNF		4927	DNF
MA	2,170		9,281	23.4%
MI	DNF		11903	DNF
MN	1,064		10,990	9.7%
MS	DNF		2808	DNF
MO	694		6,518	10.6%
MT	536		1,497	35.8%
NE	843		2,334	36.1%
NV	115		653	17.6%
NH	97		1,585	6.1%
NJ	3,944		9,969	39.6%
NM	1,790		2,038	87.8%
NY	5,397		34,316	15.7%
NC	DNF		7183	DNF
ND	0		1,887	0.0%
OH	DNF		15491	DNF
OK	1,500	e	4,023	37.3%
OR	3,505		3,900	89.9%
PA	9,535		16,104	59.2%
RI	100	e,*	1,315	7.6%
SC	1,339		4,363	30.7%
SD	5		1,925	0.3%
TN	659	e	4,209	15.7%
TX	DNF		13224	DNF
UT	950	e	2,371	40.1%
VT	23		852	2.7%
VA	DNF		3373	DNF
WA	125		6,346	2.0%
WV	DNF		1962	DNF
WI	2,560		12,069	21.2%
WY	160		819	19.5%
Total of States Reporting	51,553	e	191,915	
U.S. Est. Total	87,187			
U.S. Reported Total			324,567	26.9%

DNF indicates Data Not Furnished

* RI does not maintain a waiting list as such, but allocates resources based on perceived needs.

85

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER 6
NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS AND RESIDENTS BY TYPE OF LIVING ARRANGEMENT

Lynda Anderson
Barbara Polister
Robert Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin

This chapter describes residential settings for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD) by setting type. Three separate types of residential settings have been developed on the basis of conformity to state MR/DD reporting systems. These include:

"Congregate Care": A residence owned, rented, or managed by the residential services provider, or the provider's agent, to provide housing for persons with MR/DD in which staff provide care, instruction, supervision, and other support for residents with MR/DD (includes ICF-MR certified facilities).

"Family Foster Care": A home owned or rented by an individual or family in which they live and provide care for one or more unrelated persons with MR/DD.

"Own Home": A home owned or rented by one or more persons with MR/DD as the person(s)' own home in which personal assistance, instruction, supervision, and other support is provided as needed.

"Congregate Care" Settings and Residents

Table 2.6 presents statistics on congregate care residential settings and persons with MR/DD living in these settings on June 30, 1996, by size and state, for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Of the reported total 39,340 congregate care residential settings in the states, 37,776 (96.0%) had 15 or fewer residents and 31,496 (80.1%) had six or fewer residents. California (5,749), New York (4,188), and Pennsylvania (2,847) accounted for almost one-third (32.4%) of the total congregate care residences, while five states reported fewer than 100.

Of the 250,452 residents of congregate care settings in the reporting states, 156,940 (62.8%) lived in settings with 15 or fewer residents and 100,915 (40.3%) lived in settings with six or fewer residents. Six of the reporting states, California (34,033), Illinois (12,893), New York (29,109), Ohio (11,091), Pennsylvania (13,256), and Texas (13,224) accounted for almost half (43.3%) of the total congregate care residents.

"Family Foster Care" Settings and Residents

Table 2.7 presents statistics on family foster care settings and persons with MR/DD living in such settings on June 30, 1996, by size and state. Forty-eight states reported the number of family foster care settings by each size and 48 states reported the resident populations of each size. Where available, data from 1995 or 1994 was used in place of missing data and noted. When prior year data was unavailable, data were estimated to obtain estimated U.S. total family foster care residents (23,668).

Of the total 14,017 family foster care settings in the reporting states, virtually all (99.9%) had six or fewer residents. New York (2,066) accounted for 15.1% of the total family foster care settings across the 48 states, while 15 of the 48 reporting states reported fewer than 100 family foster care settings.

Of the 22,927 persons with MR/DD reported in family foster care settings in the 48 states that reported this data, virtually all (99.8%) lived in settings with six or fewer residents. Six states (Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin) accounted for 54.6% of the reported national total of 22,969 recipients of family foster care. Eleven of the 48 reporting states reported fewer than 100 persons in family foster care settings. Estimates for non-reporting states based on the statistics of the reporting states suggested that nationally on June 30, 1996 there were about 24,675 persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities living in 14,012 family foster care settings.

Table 2.6 Number of "Congregate Care" Residential Settings and Residents including all ICFs-MR by State on June 30, 1996

	Facilities					Residents				
State	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL	224 e	96	320	11	331	650	712	1,362	831	2,322
AK	62 e	6 e	68	1	69	222 e	73 e	295	19	314
AZ	651	9	660	9	669	2,155	108	2,263	186	2,449
AR	10 a	84 a	94	11 a	105	34 a	823 a,e	857	1,496 a	2,353
CA	4,841	601	5,442	307	5,749	21,959	2,927	24,886	9,147	34,033
CO	1,988 e	76 e	2,064	3	2,067	632 e	593 e	1,225	233 e	1,458
CT	978	51	1,029	11	1,040	2,870	400	3,270	1,209	4,479
DE	68	2	70	1	71	241	31	272	291	563
DC	137	62	199	0	199	545	349	894	0	894
FL	632	177	809	80	889	2,602	1,572 e	4,174	3,877	8,051
GA	395 b	0	395 b	9 b	404	754 b	0 b	754 b	2,019 e	2,773
HI	93	1	94	14	108	198	7	205	63	268
ID	36 e	79 e	115 e	13 e	128	145 e	521 e	666 e	442 e	1,108
IL	501	268	769	58	827	2,178	3,442	5,620	7,219	12,839
IN	198 a	356	554	24	578	980 e	2,820 e	3,800	2,228 e	6,028
IA	199 e	220 e	419	217 e	711	1,629	1,739	3,368	2,164	5,532
KS	115	98	213	16	229	546	831	1,377	1,406	2,783
KY	174	29	203	10	213	556	234	790	1,173 e	1,963
LA	425 e	126 e	551 e	25 e	576	2,493 e	1,187 e	3,680 e	3,648 e	7,328
ME	65 a	33 a	98 a	7 a	105	399 a	310 a	709 a	149 a	858
MD	1,516	51	1,567	9	1,576	3,266	353	3,619	726	4,345
MA	1,700 e	163	1,863	8	1,871	3,250 e	1,364	4,614	1,823	6,437
MI	1,678	0	1,678	3	1,681	8,741	0	8,741	346	9,087
MN	1,846 e	151 e	1,997 e	39	2,036	6,087 e	1,674 e	7,761 e	1,420	9,181
MS	117	29	146	10	156	346	292	638	2,049	2,687
MO	187	156	343	84	427	822	1,315	2,137	1,956	4,093
MT	37 e	63	100	2	102	199 e	501	700	157	857
NE	236 e	32 e	268 e	3	271	850 e	240	1,090	641	1,731
NV	26	2	28	6	34	143	19	162	154	316
NH	914	7	921	1	922	528	48	576	22	598
NJ	491	70	561	47	608	2,378	533	2,911	4,315	7,226
NM	1,311 e	19	1,330	6	1,336	127 e	181 e	308	255 e	563
NY	2,376	1,721	4,097	91	4,188	6,754	17,547	24,301	4,808	29,109
NC	751	59	810	19	829	3,486	751	4,237	2,786	7,023
ND	34 e	61	95	5	100	198	503	701	262	963
OH	640	311	951	98	1,049	2,307	3,040	5,347	5,744	11,091
OK	81 a	24 a	105	30 a	135	474 a	263 a	737 a	2,252 a	2,989
OR	452 e	71 e	523	7 e	530	1,404 e	561 e	1,965 e	621 e	2,586
PA	2,697	94	2,791	56	2,847	6,979	728	7,707	5,549	13,256
RI	152	35	187	0	187	802	337	1,139	0	1,139
SC	278	135	413	8	421	841	1,087	1,928	1,626	3,554
SD	195 e	65	260	1	261	283	684	967	252	1,219
TN	91	183	274	8	282	370	1,461	1,831	1,532	3,363
TX	751	81	832	42	874	4,263	904	5,167	8,057	13,224
UT	206 e	34 e	240	13	253	724 e	276 e	1,000	854	1,854
VT	40	0	40	0	40	146	0	146	0	146
VA	67 e	51	118	5	123	398 e	713 e	1,111	2,189	3,300
WA	39 e	42	81 e	16	97	213	400	613	1,504	2,117
WV	127	84	211	4	215	459	666	1,125	174	1,299
WI	415	102	517	40	557	1,757	830	2,587	3,364	5,951
WY	253	10	263	1	264	532	75	607	145	752
Reported Total	31,496	6,280	37,776	1,489	39,340	100,915	56,025	156,940	93,383	250,452

* total includes 7 facilities of unknown size

a indicates 1995 data

e indicates estimate

** total includes 129 people living in settings of unknown size

*** total includes 75 facilities of unknown size

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.7 Number of Family Foster Care Settings and Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in Them on June 30, 1996 by State

	Number of Residential Settings					Number of Residents				
State	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	Total
AL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AK	103	0	103 e	0	103	114	0	114 e	0	114
AZ	146	0	146	0	146	212	0	212	0	212
AR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CA	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	0	2
CO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	523	0	523	0	523	523	0	523	0	523
DE	88	0	88	0	88	159	0	159	0	159
DC	50	0	50	0	50	84	0	84	0	84
FL	DNF	DNF	121 b	DNF	121	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF
GA	DNF	DNF	210 b	0	210	DNF	DNF	351 b	0	351
HI	371	0	371	0	371	719	0	719	0	719
ID	376 e	0	376 e	0	376	517 e	0	517 e	0	517
IL	145	0	145	0	145	145	0	145	0	145
IN	304 a	10	314 a	0	314	384 a	35	419 a	0	419
IA	23	0	23	0	23	23	0	23	0	23
KS	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF
KY	213	0	213	0	213	331	0	331	0	331
LA	95 e	5	100 e	0	100	161 e	20 e	181 e	0	181
ME	DNF a	DNF	253 a	0 a	253	DNF a	DNF a	584 a	0 a	584
MD	178	0	178	0	178	292	0	292	0	292
MA	469	0	469	0	469	469	0	469	0	469
MI	756 e	0	756 e	0	756	1,890	0	1,890	0	1,890
MN	928	0	928	0	928	928	0	928	0	928
MS	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
MO	80	1	81	0	81	134	4	138	0	138
MT	150 e	0	150 e	0	150	177 e	0	177 e	0	177
NE	79 e	1	80 e	0	80	130 e	4 e	134 e	0	134
NV	25	8	33	0	33	46	31	77	0	77
NH	588	6	594	1	595	696	25	721	10	731
NJ	876	0	876	0	876	1,745	0	1,745	0	1,745
NM	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	25	0	25	0	25
NY	1,624	438	2,062	4	2066	2,967	1,162	4,129	15	4,144
NC	135	0	135	0	135	160	0	160	0	160
ND	34 e	0	34	0	34	42	0	42	0	42
OH	DNF	DNF	97	2	99	DNF	DNF	250	17	267
OK	184 a	0	184 a	0	184	236 a	0	236 a	0	236
OR	370 e	0	370 e	0	370	667 e	0	667 e	0	667
PA	1,068	1	1,069	0	1069	1,139	6	1,145	0	1,145
RI	58	1	59	0	59	64	5	69	0	69
SC	88	0	88	0	88	131	0	131	0	131
SD	20 e	0	20 e	0	20	23	0	23	0	23
TN	140	0	140	0	140	279	0	279	0	279
TX	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF
UT	83 e	0	83 e	0	83	83 e	0	83 e	0	83
VT	501	0	501	0	501	559	0	559	0	559
VA	15 e	0	15 e	0	15	31 e	0	31	0	31
WA	725 e	0	725 e	0	725	1,812	0	1,812	0	1,812
WV	433	0	433	0	433	519	0	519	0	519
WI	780	0	780	0	780	1,800	0	1,800	0	1,800
WY	32	0	32	0	32	32	0	32	0	32
Reported Total	12,858	471	14,010	7	14,017	20,450	1,292	22,927	42	22,969
Estimated Total	13,855	481	14,336	8	14,344	23,205	1,388	24,593	82	24,675

a indicates 1995 data b indicates 1994 data e indicates estimate

DNF indicates Data Not Furnished

"Own Home" Settings and Residents

Table 2.8 presents statistics on the number of homes owned or leased by persons with MR/DD who were receiving residential services and the number of persons with MR/DD living in their own homes on June 30, 1996 by size and state. Forty-seven states reported information on the number of homes and 48 states were able to report information on the number of persons living in their own homes on June 30, 1996. These statistics were used to compute estimates for the non-reporting states for an estimated U.S. total of 46,608 persons living in 35,818 residences they own or lease.

The greatest number of homes owned or leased by persons with MR/DD were reported by California (9,843), Ohio (3,058), Wisconsin (2,250) and Florida (1,937). These states together accounted for 49.9% of the reported national total of 34,327 homes owned or leased by persons with MR/DD receiving residential services and supports. Five states reported fewer than 50 places in which persons with MR/DD received services in those homes.

All people living in homes that they leased or owned lived with five or fewer other people. California (9,843), Missouri (2,024), Ohio (3,058), Washington (2,417) and Wisconsin (4,315) reported nearly half (48.1%) of the estimated national total of 45,012 people living in their own homes. Five states reported fewer than 50 persons living in their own homes.

"Family Home" Settings and Residents

Table 2.9 presents statistics on persons with MR/DD receiving services in the home of a family member on June 30, 1996. Forty-five states reported a total of 265,613 recipients receiving services in their family home. California and New York accounted for more than half of all recipients (51.1%) with an estimated 75,111 recipients and 47,903 recipients, respectively. Sixteen states had more than one-half of all the recipients of services received while living in the homes of family members. Two states (Arizona and New Hampshire) had more than 70% of all the recipients of services received while living in a family home.

Table 2.8 Number of Homes Owned or Leased by Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities and the Number of People Living in Them on June 30, 1996 by State

State	Total Homes	People Living in Their Own Home	% In Own Home	All Residents
AL	DNF	202	8%	2,395
AK	146 e	156 e	27%	584
AZ	23	36	1%	2,697
AR	469	469	17%	2,822
CA	9,843	9,843	22%	43,878
CO	448 e	448 e	12%	3,755
CT	636	636	11%	5,763
DE	9	21	3%	743
DC	1	1	0%	1,065
FL	1,937 e	1,937	19%	9,988
GA	326 b	433 b	12%	3,557
HI	82	84	7%	1,140
ID	375 e	500 e	23%	2,171
IL	93	93	1%	13,077
IN	1,000 e	1,157 e	15%	7,604
IA	1,135 e	1,135 e	14%	8,048
KS	DNF	DNF	DNF	2,783
KY	97	115	5%	2,409
LA	452 e	501 e	6%	8,011
ME	105 a	105 a	7%	1,547
MD	290 e	290	6%	4,927
MA	1,119	1,119	12%	9,281
MI	463 e	926	8%	11,903
MN	550 e	881	8%	10,990
MS	109	121	4%	2,808
MO	809 e	2,024	31%	6,518
MT	463 e	463 e	31%	1,497
NE	299 e	468 e	20%	2,334
NV	189	256	39%	653
NH	255	256	16%	1,585
NJ	382	382 e	4%	9,969
NM	DNF	164	8%	2,038
NY	1,063 e	1,063 e	3%	34,316
NC	DNF	DNF	DNF	7,183
ND	882 e	882	47%	1,887
OH	3,058 e	3,058	20%	15,491
OK	625 a	813 a	20%	4,023
OR	600 e	647 e	17%	3,900
PA	1,237	1,703	11%	16,104
RI	74 e	107	8%	1,315
SC	65 *	678	16%	4,363
SD	343 e	658	34%	1,925
TN	304	567	13%	4,209
TX	DNF	DNF	DNF	13,224
UT	434 e	434 e	18%	2,371
VT	132	147	17%	852
VA	42 e	42	1%	3,373
WA	897 e	2,417	38%	6,346
WV	91	144	7%	1,962
WI	2,250	4,315	36%	12,069
WY	35	35	4%	819
Total Reported	34,237	42,932	14%	324,567
Estimated U.S.	35,818	46,608	14%	

* indicates apartment complexes, unable to split numbers into individual settings

a indicates 1995 data b indicates 1994 data

e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2.9 Number of People with MR/DD Receiving Services While Living in the Home of a Family Member on June 30, 1996 by State

State	Number of Recipients	Total Number of Recipients of Services in Family Homes and Residential Settings	Recipients of Services in Family Homes as Percentage of All Service Recipients
AL	1,546	3,941	39%
AK	391 e	975	40%
AZ	6,519	9,216	71%
AR	0	2,822	0%
CA	75,111 e	118,989	63%
CO	3,682 e	7,437	50%
CT	6,378	12,141	53%
DE	756	1,499	50%
DC	12	1,077	1%
FL	15,985	25,973	62%
GA	DNF	DNF	DNF
HI	1,321	2,461	54%
ID	3,890 e	6,061	64%
IL	10,878	23,955	45%
IN	1,565	9,169	17%
IA	1,387 e	9,435	15%
KS	DNF	DNF	DNF
KY	2,822	5,231	54%
LA	2,563 e	10,574	24%
ME	1,152 a	2,699	43%
MD	4,329	9,256	47%
MA	DNF	DNF	DNF
MI	DNF	DNF	DNF
MN	5,121	16,111	32%
MS	30	2,838	1%
MO	4,389	10,907	40%
MT	1,658 e	3,155	53%
NE	64 e	2,398	3%
NV	311	964	32%
NH	5,183	6,768	77%
NJ	12,448 e	22,417	56%
NM	500 e	2,538	20%
NY	47,903 e	82,219	58%
NC	DNF	DNF	DNF
ND	211	2,098	10%
OH	11,421	26,912	42%
OK	1,216 a	5,239	23%
OR	700 e	4,600	15%
PA	669	16,773	4%
RI	1,699 e	3,014	56%
SC	5,632	9,995	56%
SD	127	2,052	6%
TN	2,643 e	6,852	39%
TX	DNF	DNF	DNF
UT	996 e	3,367	30%
VT	602 e	1,454	41%
VA	437	3,810	11%
WA	2,022	8,368	24%
WV	632	2,594	24%
WI	18,300	30,369	60%
WY	412	1,231	33%
U.S. Reported Total	265,613	590,180	45%

e indicates estimate

DNF indicates data not furnished

a indicates 1995 data

CHAPTER 7
CHANGING PATTERNS IN RESIDENTIAL SERVICE SYSTEMS: 1977-1996

Barbara Polister
Robert Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin
Robert Bruininks

Changing Patterns in Residential Settings

Table 2.10 presents summary statistics on the number of residential settings in which services were provided to persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD) by state agencies or by nonstate agencies licensed by the state on June 30th of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996. Totals are reported by type of operator (state or nonstate) and size of residential setting (6 or fewer residents, 7-15 residents, and 16 or more residents).

Between 1977 and 1996 the total number of residential settings in which services to persons with MR/DD were provided increased from 11,008 to 86,225 (683%). All of this growth occurred in settings with 15 or fewer residents, with settings of 7-15 residents increasing by 161% (3,882 setting) and settings with 6 or fewer residents increasing by 1,036%, or 71,467 residential settings. Of the increase of 75,349 in small residential settings between 1977 and 1996, 72,601 (98.1%) occurred in nonstate settings.

The total number of large residential settings decreased by 214 between 1977 and 1996, with the number of large nonstate facilities declining by 139 (-10.1%). The net increase in all nonstate residential settings (73,835) accounted for 98.2% of the overall increase in all residential settings. There was a decrease of 75 large state residential settings (-22.9%), but there was an increase of 1,386 community state residential settings during the same period (1,056%). The period of greatest annual growth in number of community nonstate residential settings occurred between 1992 and 1996, averaging 9,114 additional settings per year.

During the period 1982 to 1992 community state facilities grew at an average rate of 63 settings per year. Between 1992 and 1996 that rate increased to 90 new community state facilities per year.

Between 1977 and 1996 there was considerable stability in the proportions of residential settings operated by state and nonstate agencies. Between 1977 and 1996 the nonstate share of all small residential settings of 15 or fewer residents decreased slightly from 98.5% to 98.1% while during the same period the nonstate share of all large residential facilities increased from 80.8% to 83.1%. On June 30, 1977, 95.8% of all residential settings were nonstate operated; on June 30, 1996, 97.9% were nonstate operated. So, while the total number of all residential settings for persons with MR/DD increased by almost 688% between 1977 and 1996, large nonstate and large state residential settings for persons with MR/DD declined in number (-10.1% for nonstate settings; and -2.3% for state settings; -12.6 for all large settings). The total number of nonstate and state operated community residential settings increased dramatically (806% for small nonstate settings; 1,056% for small state settings; 810% for all community settings). During the most recent three year period, 1992-1996, these trends have accelerated considerably.

Changes in Number of Residential Service Recipients

Table 2.11 presents summary statistics on the number of residents with MR/DD in residential settings served by state or nonstate agencies on June 30th of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996. Totals are reported by type of operator (state or nonstate) and size of residential setting ("community" settings with 1-6 or 7-15 residents; and "large" facilities with 16 or more residents).

Between 1977 and 1996 the total number of residents of state and nonstate settings in which residential services were provided to persons with MR/DD increased from 247,780 to an estimated 323,567, an increase of 76,787 (30.9%) residents over the 18 year period. All of this growth occurred in settings with 15 or fewer residents. Of the estimated 188,505 person increase in community residential settings between 1977 and 1996, 179,029 (94.9%) occurred in nonstate settings, and 152,140 (80.7%) occurred in settings with 6 or fewer residents. The number of residents of large nonstate residential settings decreased by 15,702 (-29.8%) between 1977 and 1996, but there was a net increase in residents of all nonstate

residential settings (163,312) as community nonstate settings residents increased by 179,014 residents (148,487 in nonstate settings with 6 or fewer residents). There was, of course, a dramatic decrease in the number of people receiving residential services directly from state agencies, with a large decrease of 96,318 (-62.3%) in the population of large state residential facilities and an increase of 9,476 residents of small state residential settings.

Between 1977 and 1982 the resident population of nonstate community settings increased at an average annual rate of 4,377 persons; between 1982 to 1992 the population increase in community nonstate settings more than doubled to an average annual rate of over 10,000 persons. Between 1992 and 1996 the average annual increase in community nonstate settings was 10,789 persons. After a reported decrease of the population of nonstate settings with 7 to 15 people, between the years 1994 and 1995, the population
increased slightly in 1996 to 49,601.

The total population of large nonstate residential settings decreased from 52,718 to 37,016 between 1977 and 1996 (29.8%). Over the period, the population of large nonstate residential settings varied considerably, increasing by 4,678 persons between 1977 and 1982, followed by a decrease of 15,315 between 1982 and 1987. Between 1987 and 1992 there was an increase of 3,724 large nonstate residential facility residents as the OBRA 1987 nursing home legislation (described in Chapter 7) caused many large private settings once operated outside the MR/DD system as nursing homes to be converted to ICFs-MR within the MR/DD system. Between 1992 and 1996 the decrease of large nonstate facility residents was again evident with 8,789 fewer residents in 1996 than in 1992. Between 1977 and 1996 the proportion of all large facility residents living in nonstate facilities increased from 25.4% to 38.8%.

In summary, while the total population of all residential facilities for persons with MR/DD increased by over 30.9% between 1977 and 1996, the number of residents of large nonstate and large state residential settings declined significantly (-29.8% in nonstate settings; -62.3% in state settings; -54.0% in all large settings). The total population of state and nonstate community residential settings increased dramatically (453% in nonstate settings; 813% in state settings; 463% in all settings). Small settings with 6 or fewer residents were most prominent in these increases. Residents of such settings increased by 740% (about 150,894, individuals) between 1977 and 1996. During the most recent 4 year period reported, 1992-1996, these trends continued.

Figure 2.5 depicts graphically the residential service trends from 1977 to 1996 summarized in Table 2.10, with one change. In Figure 2.5 the categories of residents of state and nonstate community residential settings are combined in two additional categories, all residential settings with 1-6 residents and all residential settings with 7-15 residents. This breakdown shows that the rapid growth from June 30, 1977 to June 30, 1996 in the number of people living in small residential settings came primarily from growth in number of persons in residential settings with 1-6 residents. This breakdown also clearly shows the significant decrease in the total population of large state residential facilities.

Selected Data Points for Figure 2.5: **Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in State and Nonstate Residential Settings on June 30, of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996.**

Year	State, 16+ Residents	Nonstate, 16+ Residents	All, 1-6 Residents	All, 7-15 Residents
1977	154,638	52,718	20,400	20,024
1982	122,750	57,396	33,188	30,515
1987	95,022	42,081	69,933	48,637
1992	74,538	45,805	119,675	54,008
1996	58,320	37,016	172,294	56,374

Table 2.10 State and Nonstate Residential Settings for Persons with MR/DD on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996

Year	Residential Settings											
	Nonstate				State				Total			
	1-6	7-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	16+	Total
1977	6,855	2,310	1,378	10,543	43	95	327	465	6,898	2,405	1,705	11,008
1982	10,073	3,181	1,370	14,624	182	426	349	957	10,255	3,607	1,719	15,581
1987	26,475	4,713	1,370	32,558	189	443	287	919	26,664	5,156	1,657	33,477
1992	41,444	5,158	1,320	47,922	382	852	323	1,557	41,826	6,010	1,643	49,479
1996	77,457	5,600	1,239	84,378	908	687	252	1,847	78,365	6,287	1,491	86,143

Table 2.11 Persons with MR/DD Receiving State and Nonstate Residential Services on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996

Year	Residents											
	Nonstate Settings				State Settings				All Settings			
	1-6	7-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	16+	Total
1977	20,184	19,074	52,718	91,976	216	950	154,638	155,804	20,400	20,024	207,356	247,780
1982	32,335	28,810	57,396	118,541	853	1,705	122,750	125,308	33,188	30,515	180,146	243,849
1987	68,631	45,223	42,081	155,935	1,302	3,414	95,022	99,738	69,933	48,637	137,103	255,673
1992	118,304	46,023	45,805	210,132	1,371	7,985	74,538	83,894	119,675	54,008	120,343	294,026
1996	168,671	49,601	37,016	255,288	3,869	6,773	58,320	68,962	172,540	56,389	95,336	324,567

Figure 2.4
Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in State and Nonstate Residential Settings on June 30 of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992 and 1996



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Residential Settings, by Size, of Persons with MR/DD in 1982 and 1996

Figure 2.4 presents statistics on the number of persons with MR/DD receiving residential services, including nursing home residents, by size in 1982 and 1996. Residential settings of the 362,248 persons reported on June 30, 1996 provide a very different profile than those of the 284,207 persons with MR/DD reported on June 30, 1982.

In 1982, more than three-fifths (63.3%) of all residents lived in MR/DD settings of 16 or more persons, 68% of whom were in state-operated facilities. An additional 14.3% were in generic nursing facilities. Only 11.7% lived in settings of 6 or fewer residents, with an additional 10.7% in settings of 7 to 15 residents.

By 1996, over half (53.2%) of all residents lived in settings of 6 or fewer persons, with an additional 17.4% living in settings of 7 to 15 persons. Only 95,336 persons (26.4%) were in MR/DD settings of 16 or more residents, 61.2% of whom were in state-operated facilities. Generic nursing home residents with MR/DD were 10.4% of the reported population.

Figure 2.5 People with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in Residential Settings of Different Sizes on June 30, 1982 and June 30, 1996



SECTION III

STATUS AND CHANGES IN MEDICAID FUNDED RESIDENTIAL AND RELATED SERVICES

CHAPTER 8
BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF MEDICAID LONG-TERM CARE PROGRAMS[12]

This chapter provides a brief overview of the development of Medicaid programs for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities (MR/DD).

Federal Involvement Prior to ICFs-MR

Before 1965 there was no federal participation in long-term care for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities. In 1965, Medicaid was enacted as Medical Assistance, Title XIX of the Social Security Act. It provided federal matching funds of from 50% to 82%, depending on each state's per capita income, for medical assistance provided to people in the categories of blind, disabled, and their dependent children and their families as well as to elderly people. Otherwise eligible persons who resided in public institutions except "medical institutions" were excluded. Persons in public MR/DD institutions were still excluded from coverage, although otherwise eligible adult residents of private nursing homes became qualified for Medicaid participation if the homes met established standards. Also eligible for federally cost-shared long-term care were persons 65 years or older residing in public mental hospitals meeting federal standards. Because on June 30, 1964 public psychiatric institutions held 144,000 residents age 65 years or older (about three-quarters as many people as were in large state MR/DD facilities) most states had considerable incentives to invest available state funds in bringing their public psychiatric institutions up to federal standards (Lakin, 1979; National Institute on Mental Health, 1975).

Title XIX also created for states an incentive to convert their public institutions into "medical institutions," that is, Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs). Once this was done, the residents were then eligible for inpatient coverage under Title XIX. Eleven states actually did so between 1966 and 1969, financing long-term care for 37,821 people with MR/DD in state institution units at a total cost of 168 million dollars in Fiscal Year 1969 (Boggs, Lakin, & Clauser, 1985). Thus, Title XIX in its early form brought a number of incentives that were not necessarily beneficial to persons with MR/DD in long-term care settings. By 1970 the effects of these policies were increasingly viewed as detrimental to providing the kinds of residential care then considered most appropriate. In 1970 efforts were initiated to create a Medicaid long-term benefit for persons with MR/DD. A quarter century later most long-term care service expenditures for persons with MR/DD are financed through Medicaid and most persons with MR/DD receiving long-term care services receive Medicaid financed services.

Establishment of the ICF-MR Program

It was only shortly after the introduction of federal reimbursement for skilled nursing care in 1965 that the U.S. Senate noted rapid growth in the numbers of people who were becoming patients in Skilled Nursing Facilities. It was further documented that many of these individuals were receiving far more medical care than they actually needed, at a greater cost than was needed, largely because of the incentives of placing people in facilities for which half or more of the costs were reimbursed through the federal Title XIX program. Therefore, in 1967, a less medically oriented and less expensive "Intermediate Care Facility" (ICF) program for elderly and disabled adults was authorized under Title XI of the Social Security Act. In 1971 the SNF and ICF programs were combined under Title XIX. Within the legislation combining the two programs was a little noticed, scarcely debated amendment that for the first time authorized FFP for "intermediate care" provided in facilities specifically for people with mental retardation.

Three primary outcomes of the ICF-MR legislation appear to have been intended by Congress: 1) to provide substantial federal incentives for upgrading the physical environment and the quality of care and habilitation being provided in public MR/DD institutions; 2) to neutralize the above mentioned incentives for states to place persons with MR/DD in nonstate nursing homes and/or to certify their state institutions as SNFs; and 3) to provide a program for care and habilitation ("active treatment") specifically focused on the needs of persons with MR/DD rather than upon medical care. Many proponents of the new

[12] Adapted and updated from E. Boggs, K.C. Lakin, and S. Clauser (1985)

ICF-MR program also saw it as a way to enlist the federal government in assisting states with their rapidly increasing state institution costs, which were averaging real dollar increases of 14% per year in the five years prior to the passage of the ICF-MR legislation (Greenberg, Lakin, Hill, Bruininks, & Hauber, 1985).

The ICF-MR program was initiated in a period of rapid change in residential care for persons with MR/DD. By Fiscal Year 1973 state institution populations had already decreased to 173,775 from their high of 194,650 in Fiscal Year 1967 (Lakin, 1979). Nevertheless, states overwhelmingly opted to participate in the ICF-MR program, with two notable outcomes: 1) nearly every state took steps to secure federal participation in paying for state institution services, and 2) in order to maintain federal participation, most states were compelled to invest substantial amounts of state dollars in bringing institutions into conformity with ICF-MR standards. Forty states had at least one ICF-MR certified state institution by June 30, 1977. Nearly a billion state dollars were invested in institutional improvement efforts in Fiscal Years 1978-1980 alone, primarily to meet ICF-MR standards (Gettings & Mitchell, 1980).

In the context of growing support for community residential services, such statistics were used by a growing number of critics to charge that the ICF-MR program 1) had created direct incentives for maintaining people in state institutions by providing federal contributions for 50% to 80% of the costs of those institutions; 2) had diverted funds that could otherwise have been spent on community program development into institution renovations solely to obtain FFP; 3) had promoted the development of private ICF-MR institutions for people leaving state institutions through available FFP (11,943 people were living in ICF-MR units in private institutions by June 1977); and 4) had promoted organizational inefficiency and individual dependency by promoting a single uniform standard for care and oversight of ICF-MR residents irrespective of the nature and degree of their disabilities and/or their relative capacity for independence. These criticisms, and the growing desire to increase residential opportunities in community settings, along with the continued desire of states to avail themselves of the favorable federal cost-share for ICF-MR care, helped stimulate the development of small ICFs-MR and the eventual clarification by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) of how the ICF-MR level of care could be delivered in relatively small (4-15 person) group homes.

Small Community ICF-MR Group Homes

Expansion of ICF-MR services to privately-operated programs in the late 1970's and the 1980's was a major development in the evolution of the program. Private residential facilities were not an issue at the time of original ICF-MR enactment in 1971, probably because: 1) most private facilities were already technically covered under the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act authorizing private ICF programs, and 2) in 1971 state facilities were by far the predominant model of residential care. Indeed, the 1969 Master Facility Inventory indicated a total population in nonstate mental retardation facilities of about 25,000, compared with a large state MR/DD facility population of 190,000 (Lakin, Bruininks, Doth, Hill, & Hauber, 1982).

Although Congressional debate about the ICF-MR programs had focused on public institutions, the statute did not specifically limit ICF-MR coverage either to public facilities, or to "institutions" in the common meaning of the term. The definition of "institution" which served as the basis for participation in the ICF-MR program is the one that also covered the general ICF institution: "four or more people in single or multiple units" (45 CFR Sec. 448.60 (6) (1)). Although it cannot be determined whether Congress, in authorizing a "four or more bed" facility, purposely intended the ICF-MR benefit to be available in small facilities, it does seem reasonable to suppose, in the absence of specific limitations, that Congress was more interested in improving the general quality of residential care than it was in targeting specific types of facilities. ICF-MR regulations, first published in January 1974, also supported the option of developing relatively small facilities, delineating two categories of ICFs-MR, those housing 16 or more people ("large") and those housing 15 or fewer people ("community") and providing several specifications that allowed greater flexibility in meeting ICF-MR standards in the smaller facilities.

Despite the regulatory recognition of community ICFs-MR, the numbers of such ICFs-MR actually developed varied enormously among states and regions. In some DHHS regions (e.g., Region V) hundreds of community ICFs-MR were developed while other regions (e.g., II and X) had none. By mid-1977 three-quarters (74.5%) of the 188 community ICFs-MR were located in just two states (Minnesota and Texas), and by mid-1982 nearly half (46.4%) of the 1,202 community ICFs-MR were located in Minnesota and New York and nearly two-thirds (65.1%) were located

in Minnesota, New York, Michigan and Texas. These variations reflected what some states and national organizations considered a failure of the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) to delineate clear and consistent policy guidelines for certifying community facilities for ICF-MR participation and/or reluctance on the part of some regional HCFA agencies to promote the option.

In response to continued complaints from the states that there was a need to clarify policy regarding the certification of community ICFs-MR, in 1981 HCFA issued "Interpretive Guidelines" for certifying community ICFs-MR. These guidelines did not change the existing standards for the ICF-MR program, but clarified how the existing standards could be applied to delivering the ICF-MR level of care in community facilities with 4 to 15 residents. The publication of the 1981 guidelines was followed by substantially greater numbers of states exercising the option to develop community ICFs-MR. Ironically, these guidelines were published in the same year (1981) that Congress enacted legislation that would give even greater opportunity and flexibility to states to use Medicaid funding for community services, the Medicaid Home and Community Based Services waiver authority (Section 2176 of P.L. 97-35).

Home and Community Based Services (HCBS)

Section 2176 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35), passed on August 13, 1981, granted the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to waive certain existing Medicaid requirements and allow states to finance certain "non-institutional" services for Medicaid-eligible individuals. The HCBS program was designed to provide home and community based services for people who are aged, blind, disabled, or who have MR/DD and who, in the absence of alternative non-institutional services, would remain in or would be at a risk of being placed in a Medicaid facility (i.e., a Nursing Facility or an ICF-MR). Final regulations were published in March 1985 and since then a number of new regulations and interpretations have been developed, although none have changed the fundamental premise of the program, that of using home- and community-based services and supports to reduce the need for institutional services.

Non-institutional services that can be provided under the HCBS waiver include case management, personal care services, adult day health services, habilitation services, respite care, or any other service that a state can show will lead to decreased costs for Medicaid funded long-term care. Although not allowed to use HCBS reimbursements to pay for room and board, all states offering HCBS to persons with MR/DD do provide residential support services under the categories of personal care, habilitation, and homemaker services, using cash assistance from other Social Security Act programs to fund people's room and board costs. In 1996 about 70.9% of HCBS recipients in the 36 states reporting such data received services in settings other than the home of natural or adoptive family members. Given both its flexibility and its potential for promoting individualization of services, the HCBS program is recognized in all states as a significant resource in the provision of community services as an alternative to institutional care. Recently, requirements that prevailed in the HCBS program's first 10 years that states demonstrate reductions in projected ICF-MR residents and expenditures roughly equal to the increases in HCFA participants and expenditures have been considerably relaxed. As a result, there has been recent dramatic growth in the number of HCBS participants, even as the number of ICF-MR participants has remained stable. All states now provide HCBS and more persons with MR/DD participate in the HCBS program than in any other Medicaid long-term care program.

Community Supported Living Arrangements(CSLA)

In 1990 Congress enacted Section 1930 to the Social Security Act to allow up to eight states to provide Community Supported Living Arrangements (CSLA) to Medicaid-eligible persons with MR/DD for a five-year period. Separate from, but in many ways similar to, the Medicaid HCBS program, CSLA provided greater flexibility in service provision, permitted specific targeting of services to eligible groups and geographic areas within a state, did not require demonstration of ICF-MR or nursing home level-of-care need for eligibility and allowed each state to develop its own quality assurance plan within defined federal guidelines. Total cost of the CSLA program was capped on an annual basis in each of the program's first five years and at a five year total of 100 million dollars, evenly divided among the eight states permitted to add CSLA to their state Medicaid program. At the end of its authorization CSLA was servicing 3,441 people with Fiscal Year 1995 expenditures of $38.4 million dollars. At the termination of the program on September 30, 1995 virtually all participants and expenditures were merged into state HCBS programs.

Medicaid Nursing Facilities

As noted earlier, almost from the inception of Medicaid, states noted incentives for placing persons

with MR/DD in Medicaid certified nursing facilities. Almost as soon as this began to happen there was a sense among the advocacy community that many more people with MR/DD were living in nursing homes than were appropriately served in them (National Association for Retarded Citizens, 1975). As concern grew, supportive documentation was sought through evaluation studies. The largest such study, involving 2,700 Illinois nursing home residents with MR/DD (Davis, Silverstein, Uehara, & Sadden, 1987), concluded that only 10% of the residents clearly needed services that warranted nursing home placement.

In 1987 Congress responded to these and other criticisms of nursing facility care in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-203). Provisions of this legislation restricted criteria for admissions to Medicaid reimbursed nursing facilities, so that only those persons requiring the medical/nursing services offered could be admitted. Current residents not in need of nursing services were required to be moved to "more appropriate" residential facilities, with the exception of individuals living in a specific nursing home for more than 30 months should they choose to stay. In either case nursing facilities were required to assure that each person's needs for "active treatment" were met. Despite these requirements the estimated number of people with MR/DD reported to Medicaid-certified nursing facilities in 1996 (37,600) was almost identical to the number in 1970 (38,000) when the ICF-MR program was first conceived, in part, to halt the disturbing growth in the number of people with MR/DD who were being placed in nursing homes.

CHAPTER 9
UTILIZATION OF AND EXPENDITURES FOR MEDICAID INSTITUTIONAL AND HOME AND COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES

K. Charlie Lakin
Barbara Polister
Robert W. Prouty

This chapter provides statistics on the utilization of the three primary Medicaid long-term care programs for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities: Intermediate Care Facilities for (persons with) Mental Retardation (ICF-MR), Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS), and Nursing Facilities (NF). These statistics are reported on a state by state basis because of the substantial variability among states in program utilization.

ICF-MR Program Utilization on June 30, 1996

Number of facilities. Table 3.1 presents state-by-state statistics on the number of ICFs-MR in the United States by size and state/nonstate operation on June 30, 1996. The total of 7,083 ICFs-MR compares with 574 ICFs-MR reported on June 30, 1977; 1,889 on June 30, 1982; 3,913 on June 30, 1987; and 6,512 on June 30, 1992. The increase in total ICFs-MR between 1987 and 1996 was significant, not only in amount (3,170 facilities) and percent (81.0%) of increase, but also because the average annual increase of 352 facilities exceeded the average annual increase of 334 facilities in the preceding ten-year period. The period between June 1993 and June 1996 provided the first ever decrease in ICFs-MR. There was a substantial reduction of 528 between June 1993 and June 1996 from the 1993 total of 7,611. The major contribution to this reduction was New York which was operating 526 fewer ICFs-MR in 1994 than 1993, 515 fewer in June 1995 than in 1994 and 8 fewer in 1996 than in 1995. The decrease in New York came primarily from the conversion of community ICFs-MR (with 15 or fewer residents) to settings financed by the Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) waiver (see Chapter 10). However, between 1995 and 1996, the total number of ICFs-MR increased by 136 facilities, 112 of which served 6 or fewer residents.

Over four-fifths (87.6%) of the 7,083 ICFs-MR on June 30, 1996 were in the 15 states with 100 or more ICFs-MR each. Of these, over one-half (52.3%) were concentrated in five states (California, Indiana, Michigan, New York, and Texas) with more than 500 ICFs-MR each. In contrast, 14 states had fewer than 10 ICFs-MR and their combined total of 68 was only 1% of all ICFs-MR.

The vast majority of all ICFs-MR (88.9%) on June 30, 1996 were community facilities (15 or fewer residents), of which three-fifths (60.9%) had six or fewer residents. Most (85.5%) of all ICFs-MR with six or fewer residents were in nine states (California, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Texas). Seventeen states reported no ICFs-MR with six or fewer residents and eight states (Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oregon, and Wyoming) reported no community ICFs-MR of any size.

Three states (District of Columbia, Rhode Island, and Vermont) reported having no large ICFs-MR on June 30, 1996. Twenty-two other states reported having five or fewer large ICFs-MR. Almost half (47.4%) of all large ICFs-MR were located in six states with 40 or more large ICFs-MR each (Florida, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Texas and Wisconsin) and more than two-thirds (69.0%) in the eleven states with 30 or more large ICFs-MR each. Large ICFs-MR were predominantly (68.7%) nonstate operated. Almost all (97.4%) ICFs-MR with six or fewer residents were nonstate operated, as were almost all (97.1%) ICFs-MR of 7 to 15 residents. Of the total 7,083 ICFs-MR reported on June 30, 1996, 6,668 (94.1%) were operated by nonstate agencies.

Table 3.1 ICF-MR Certified Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State

State	State Operated Facilities					Nonstate-Operated Facilities					All Facilities				
	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL	0	0	0	5	5	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	5	7
AK	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	6	0	6	4	2	6	1	7
AZ	1	7	8	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	8	2	10
AR	0	0	0	6	6	0	30	30	0	30	0	30	30	6	36
CA	0	0	0	7	7	838	50	888	24	912	838	50	888	31	919
CO	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	4	1	5	4	0	4	3	7
CT	13	30	43	9	52	65	4	69	0	69	78	34	112	9	121
DE	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	1	3
DC	0	0	0	0	0	81	42	123	0	123	81	42	123	0	123
FL	0	0	0	4	4	40	3	43	48	91	40	3	43	52	95
GA	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	9
HI	0	0	0	1	1	19	1	20	0	20	19	1	20	1	21
ID	0	0	0	1	1	10	38	48	2	50	10	38	48	3	51
IL	0	0	0	11	11	41	199	240	49	289	41	199	240	60	300
IN	0	0	0	7	7	194	356	550	14	564	194	356	550	21	571
IA	0	0	0	2	2	52 e	49 e	101	32 e	133 e	52	49	101	34	135
KS	0	0	0	3	3	12	22	34	10	44	12	22	34	13	47
KY	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	9	9
LA	13	0	13	9	22	339	105	444	12	456	352	105	457	21	478
ME	0	4	4	1	5	19	15	34	5	39	19	19	38	6	44
MD	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
MA	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
MI	0	0	0	3	3	498	0	498	0	498	498	0	498	3	501
MN	15	0	15	5	20	136	131	267	34	301	151	131	282	39	321
MS	0	19	19	5	24	0	0	0	5	5	0	19	19	10	29
MO	0	0	0	6	6	2	9	11	2	13	2	9	11	8	19
MT	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3
NE	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	3	4
NV	1	1	2	2	4	11	1	12	0	12	12	2	14	2	16
NH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
NJ	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	10	10
NM	0	0	0	1	1	12	19	31	5	36	12	19	31	6	37
NY	9	8	17	45	62	114	625	739	41	780	123	633	756	86	842
NC	0	0	0	5	5	236	27	263	11	274	236	27	263	16	279
ND	0	0	0	1	1	27	34	61	1	62	27	34	61	2	63
OH	0	0	0	12	12	35	202	237	80	317	35	202	237	92	329
OK	0	0	0	3	3	2 e	2 e	4	27 e	31 e	2	2	4	30	34
OR	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
PA	0	0	0	11	11	134	86	220	24	244	134	86	220	35	255
RI	0	0	0	0	0	41	4	45	0	45	41	4	45	0	45
SC	0	0	0	5	5	16	131	147	3	150	16	131	147	8	155
SD	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	9	0	9	0	9	9	1	10
TN	0	0	0	5	5	25	47	72	3	75	25	47	72	8	80
TX	46	3	49	13	62	705	78	783	28	811	751	81	832	41	873
UT	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	12	13	0	1	1	13	14
VT	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	3	0	3	0	3
VA	0	0	0	5	5	2 e	14 e	16	0	16	2	14	16	5	21
WA	0	0	0	4	4	7	3	10	13	23	7	3	10	17	27
WV	0	0	0	1	1	12	48	60	2	62	12	48	60	3	63
WI	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	1	37	38	0	1	1	40	41
WY	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
U.S. Total	98	72	170	245	415	3,736	2,394	6,130	538	6,668	3,834	2,466	6,300	783	7,083
% of all ICFs-MR	1.4%	1.0%	2.4%	3.5%	5.9%	52.7%	33.8%	86.5%	7.6%	94.1%	54.1%	34.8%	88.9%	11.1%	100.0%

a indicates 1995 data e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Number of residents. Table 3.2 presents state- by-state statistics on the number of people residing in ICFs-MR of different sizes and state/nonstate operation on June 30, 1996. There were a total of 129,449 ICF-MR residents on June 30, 1996. This represented the third consecutive year of substantial decrease in ICF-MR populations. Between June 1995 and June 1996 ICF-MR populations decreased by 4,935 people following decreases between June 1994 and June 1995 of 7,734 people and of 5,611 people between June 1993 and June 1994. Thirty-eight states reported some reduction in their total population of ICF-MR residents between June 30, 1995 and June 30, 1996. In June 1996 the greatest number of ICF-MR residents was in Texas (13,224). This was only the second year in 20 years that a state other than New York (11,846 ICF-MR residents in June 1996) had the largest number of ICF-MR residents. California, Illinois, New York, and Texas all had over 10,000 ICF-MR residents, while Alaska, New Hampshire and Vermont each had fewer than 100.

Nonstate ICF-MR Utilization on June 30, 1996

Throughout the period from 1977 to 1996, there has been a steady and substantial shift toward nonstate operation of ICFs-MR, although significantly less than the shift toward nonstate residential services generally. In 1977 the 13,312 nonstate ICF-MR residents made up only 12.5% of all ICF-MR residents. By 1982, 32,044 nonstate ICF-MR residents made up 22.8% of all ICF-MR residents. By 1987, the 53,052 nonstate ICF-MR residents were 36.8% of all ICF-MR residents and by June 30, 1995, a majority (73,437 or 54.6%) of all ICF-MR residents were in nonstate ICFs-MR. On June 30, 1996, there were 71,363 residents of nonstate-operated ICFs-MR. This was a decrease of 2,074 residents, between June 1995 and June 1996 but represented an increase in percentage of all ICF-MR residents to 55.1%.

Large nonstate ICFs-MR. Since 1977 there has been a strong trend toward "privatization" of all residential services, including those provided in ICFs-MR. This has happened primarily as the majority of people receiving residential services has moved from large state facilities to relatively small, overwhelmingly nonstate residential settings. Most of the growth in the number of residents in large nonstate 30, 1977. The ICF-MR certification of large nonstate facilities continued at a generally high rate until 1987, when there were 32,398 residents. Since then there ICFs-MR took place in the decade between program inception and 1982. There were 23,686 ICF-MR residents on June 30, 1982, 11,728 more than on June has been a net decrease in number of large nonstate ICF-MR residents. On June 30, 1996, 28,232 people were living in large nonstate ICFs-MR of 16 or more residents. From June 30, 1977 to June 30, 1982 states were on the average increasing large nonstate ICF-MR facility populations by 2,340 per year, whereas in the nine years between 1987 and 1996, the large nonstate ICF-MR population decreased by 4,166 residents (an average of 463 per year).

It should be noted that the net national increase of 4,546 residents in large nonstate ICFs-MR between 1982 and 1996 was primarily the result of a few states certifying existing large, nonstate MR/DD and nursing facilities as ICFs-MR as described above. The average number of people living in large nonstate ICFs-MR decreased from 76 to 52.5 residents between 1977 and 1996.

Table 3.2 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities Living in ICF-MR Certified Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State and Size

State	Residents in State-Operated Facilities					Residents in Nonstate-Operated Facilities					Residents in All Facilities				
	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL	0	0	0	800	800	0	25	25	0	25	0	25	25	800	825
AK	0	0	0	19	19	20	20	40	0	40	20	20	40	19	59
AZ	3	79	82	65	147	0	0	0	46	46	3	79	82	111	193
AR	0	0	0	1,272	1,272	0	300	300	0	300	0	300	300	1,272	1,572
CA	0	0	0	4,581	4,581	3,411	573	3,984	1,668	5,652	3,411	573	3,984	6,249	10,233
CO	0	0	0	197	197	12	0	12	36	48	12	0	12	233	245
CT	75	219	294	646	940	324	34	358	0	358	399	253	652	646	1,298
DE	0	0	0	284	284	0	16	16	0	16	0	16	16	284	300
DC	0	0	0	0	0	421	333	754	0	754	421	333	754	0	754
FL	0	0	0	1,291	1,291	238	DNF	238	1,913	2,151	238	0	238	3,204	3,442
GA	0	0	0	1,909	1,909	0	0	0	110 e	110 e	0	0	0	2,019	2,019
HI	0	0	0	49	49	71	7	78	0	78	71	7	78	49	127
ID	0	0	0	123	123	45	312	357	58	415	45	312	357	181	538
IL	0	0	0	3,718	3,718	240	2,957	3,197	3,501	6,698	240	2,957	3,197	7,219	10,416
IN	0	0	0	1,212	1,212	970	2,820	3,790	984	4,774	970	2,820	3,790	2,196	5,986
IA	0	0	0	672	672	134	460	594	916	1,510	134	460	594	1,588	2,182
KS	0	0	0	676	676	72	218	290	620	910	72	218	290	1,296	1,586
KY	0	0	0	644	644	0	0	0	513 e	513 e	0	0	0	1,157 e	1,157
LA	78	0	78	2,031	2,109	2,018	830	2,848	1,145	3,993	2,096	830	2,926	3,176	6,102
ME	0	48	48	19	67	114	155	269	109	378	114	203	317	128	445
MD	0	0	0	652	652	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	652	652
MA	0	0	0	1,795	1,795	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,795	1,795
MI	0	0	0	346	346	2,839	0	2,839	0	2,839	2,839	0	2,839	346	3,185
MN	90	0	90	345	435	792	1,524	2,316	1,075	3,391	882	1,524	2,406	1,420	3,826
MS	0	189	189	1,312	1,501	0	0	0	625	625	0	189	189	1,937	2,126
MO	0	0	0	1,494	1,494	12	71	83	66	149	12	71	83	1,560	1,643
MT	0	0	0	157	157	0	8	8	0	8	0	8	8	157	165
NE	0	0	0	401	401	0	9	9	240	249	0	9	9	641	650
NV	6	12	18	150	168	57	7	64	0	64	63	19	82	150	232
NH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	0	0	0	22	22
NJ	0	0	0	4,017	4,017	0	0	0	74	74	0	0	0	4,091	4,091
NM	0	0	0	145	145	49 e	181 e	230	110 e	340 e	49 e	181 e	230 e	255 e	485
NY	45	79	124	3,399	3,523	546	6,467	7,013	1,310	8,323	591	6,546	7,137	4,709	11,846
NC	0	0	0	2,227	2,227	1,416	470	1,886	480	2,366	1,416	470	1,886	2,707	4,593
ND	0	0	0	148	148	160	266	426	50	476	160	266	426	198	624
OH	0	0	0	2,087	2,087	193	1,978	2,171	3,498	5,669	193	1,978	2,171	5,585	7,756
OK	0	0	0	553	553	12 e	26 e	38 e	1,684 e	1,722 e	12 e	26 e	38 e	2,237 e	2,275
OR	0	0	0	429	429	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	429	429
PA	0	0	0	3,164	3,164	695	661	1,356	1,949	3,305	695	661	1,356	5,113	6,469
RI	0	0	0	0	0	193	32	225	0	225	193	32	225	0	225
SC	0	0	0	1,548	1,548	64	1,050	1,114	78	1,192	64	1,050	1,114	1,626	2,740
SD	0	0	0	252	252	0	97	97	0	97	0	97	97	252	349
TN	0	0	0	1,388	1,388	120	376	496	144	640	120	376	496	1,532	2,028
TX	251	35	286	5,735	6,021	4,012	869	4,881	2,322	7,203	4,263	904	5,167	8,057	13,224
UT	0	0	0	311	311	0	12	12	543	555	0	12	12	854	866
VT	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	15	0	15	15	0	15	0	15
VA	0	0	0	2,189	2,189	10 e	158 e	168 e	0	168 e	10 e	158 e	168 e	2,189 e	2,357
WA	0	0	0	1,008	1,008	41	24	65	114	179	41	24	65	1,122	1,187
WV	0	0	0	75	75	64	390	454	59	513	64	390	454	134	588
WI	0	0	0	1,197	1,197	0	15	15	2,170	2,185	0	15	15	3,367	3,382
WY	0	0	0	145	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	145
U.S. Total	548	661	1,209	56,877	58,086	19,380	23,751	43,131	28,232	71,363	19,928	24,412	44,340	85,109	129,449
% of all in ICF-MR	0.4%	0.5%	0.9%	43.9%	44.9%	15.0%	18.3%	33.3%	21.8%	55.1%	15.4%	18.9%	34.3%	65.7%	100.0%

e indicates 1995 data
e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nonstate community ICFs-MR. On June 30, 1996 nonstate community ICFs-MR (15 or fewer residents) made up 86.5% of all ICFs-MR, although only 33.3% of all ICF-MR residents lived in them. These numbers compare with 26% of facilities and 1.3% of residents in 1977, 56% of facilities and 6.0% of residents in 1982, and 70.3% of facilities and 14.3% of residents in 1987. From 1982 to 1996, nonstate community ICFs-MR grew by 43,131 residents as compared with 4,620 residents in large nonstate ICFs-MR.

Further broken down, on June 30, 1996 of the 43,131 people living in nonstate community ICFs-MR, 44.9% (19,380) were living in ICFs-MR of six or fewer residents. In comparison, on June 30, 1977 of the 1,354 community ICF-MR residents, 18.6% (252) lived in ICFs-MR of six or fewer residents, and on June 30, 1982, of the 8,358 community nonstate ICF-MR residents, 28% (2,364) were living in ICFs-MR of six or fewer residents. Because of increasing development of ICFs-MR with six or fewer residents, average nonstate community ICFs-MR size dropped from 8.0 residents in 1982 to 7.0 residents in 1996.

On June 30, 1996 the nine states with the greatest number of nonstate community ICF-MR residents (California, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, and Texas) had 76.6% of all nonstate community ICF-MR residents. New York (with 6.8% of the U.S. population) had 16.3% of the total population of nonstate community ICFs-MR in 1996, but this represents a significant reduction from 1993 when New York had 26.6% of all nonstate community ICFs-MR. In contrast, of the 41 states utilizing nonstate community ICFs-MR, the two-thirds (26) with the lowest utilization rate had a total of only 8.6% of all residents on June 30, 1996.

State ICF-MR Utilization

The proportion of ICF-MR residents living in state facilities has been decreasing steadily since 1982. But Fiscal Year 1996 was just the fourth year since the beginning of the ICF-MR program that fewer ICF-MR residents lived in state facilities than in nonstate facilities; 44.9% of all ICF-MR residents on June 30, 1996. Prior to Fiscal Year 1994 there had been steady growth in state-operated community ICFs-MR; for example, from 2,874 residents on June 30, 1987 to 6,526 residents on June 30, 1993. In Fiscal Year 1994 residents of state-operated community ICFs-MR decreased by 749 persons, and in Fiscal Year 1995 they decreased by 4,603. New York's conversion of state-operated community ICFs-MR to its Medicaid HCBS waiver program was almost exclusively responsible for these changes. However, with these conversions largely completed in New York, between Fiscal Years 1995 and 1996 the number of state-operated community ICF-MR residents increased from 1,174 to 1,209 (3.0%). Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 present the current status of ICF-MR utilization described below.

Large state ICFs-MR. Nationally on June 30, 1996, the population of large state MR/DD facilities with ICF-MR certification was 56,877 (out of a total large state MR/DD facility population of 58,320). Although the percentage of large state MR/DD facility residents living in ICF-MR certified units increased from 88% to 97.5% between 1982 and 1996, there was an overall reduction in the population of large state ICFs-MR. From June 30, 1982 to June 30, 1996 there was a national net decrease of 50,742 residents of large state ICFs-MR, as compared with a net increase of 14,856 residents between June 30, 1977 and June 30, 1982. This trend toward lower numbers of residents in large state ICFs-MR was evident in all but 8 states.

Two major factors affected the rather notable change from an average increase of about 3,000 per year in the number of ICF-MR recipients living in state institutions between 1977 and 1982 to an average decrease of about 3,624 per year between 1982 and 1996. Between June 30, 1977 and June 30, 1982 states were increasing the proportion of their large state MR/DD facility capacity certified to participate in the ICF-MR program from about 60% of the national total to about 88%. Therefore, although states were decreasing large state MR/DD facility populations over the period by about a quarter, the number of newly certified facilities led to an overall increase in persons living in ICF-MR certified units. However, by 1982, with nearly 90% of large state MR/DD facility residents already living in units with ICF-MR certification, the ongoing depopulation of these facilities caused substantial decreases in the number of residents in ICF-MR units. The decreasing populations in large state MR/DD facilities continues to reduce the extent to which the ICF-MR program is essentially a large state MR/DD facility-centered program. In 1992, for the first time, fewer then half (48.7%) of all ICF-MR residents lived in large state MR/DD facilities. In 1996 43.9% of ICF-MR residents lived in large state MR/DD facilities. This compares with 87.1% in 1977; 76.3% in 1982, and 61.3% in 1987.

State-operated community ICFs-MR

On June 30, 1996 there were only 170 state-operated community ICFs-MR still operating in the United States. In all, only 1,209 (0.9%) of all ICF-MR residents lived in these facilities. In Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 there was a dramatic decrease in the number of people living in state-operated community ICFs-MR, from 6,526 people in June 1993 to 1,174 people in June 1995. Again this change was almost wholly attributable to New York which reduced the number of persons living in state-operated community ICFs-MR from 5,227 in June 1993 to 136 in June 1995. These changes reflect little change in place of residence. They were created by New York's conversion of state-operated community ICFs-MR to group homes financed through the Medicaid Home and Community Based Services waiver.

In Fiscal Year 1996, the population of state community ICFs-MR grew by 3%. Of the total 1,209 residents of state-operated community ICFs-MR in June 1996 73.9% lived in Connecticut (294), Texas (286), Mississippi (189) and New York (124). On average, state community ICFs-MR (with an average of 7.1 residents per facility) were about the same size as nonstate community ICFs-MR (an average of 7.0 residents).

Figure 3.1 shows ICF-MR residents as a proportion of all persons receiving residential services in state and nonstate facilities of different sizes on June 30, 1996. As shown, 97.5% of large state MR/DD facility residents lived in ICF-MR units, as did 76.3% of large nonstate facility residents. Nationally, 47.9% of the people living in nonstate settings of 7 to 15 residents, and 20.0% of the people living in nonstate settings of six or fewer residents resided in ICFs-MR. About 31.2% of state-operated community setting residents lived in ICFs-MR.

Figure 3.2 shows the proportion of all ICF-MR residents living in each of the four types of ICFs-MR described above from 1977 to 1996. It shows the substantial growth in the number of residents in ICFs-MR other than large state residential facilities, but also, that large state residential facilities remain the single most frequently used setting for ICF-MR services. It also shows that the substantial shifts in the types of ICFs-MR in which people have lived has occurred within a context of considerable stability in the total number of ICF-MR residents since 1982.

Figure 3.1
ICF-MR Residents as a Proportion of All Residents of State and Nonstate Settings by Size on June 30, 1996



Figure 3.2
Residents of ICF-MR Certified Facilities by Size and State/Nonstate Operation on June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996



Large and Small ICFs-MR

Table 3.3 reports the total number of persons with MR/DD who a) live in large (16 or more residents) and community (15 or fewer residents) ICFs-MR, b) live in all ICF/MR and non-ICF-MR residential settings in which they receive services licensed or provided by state agencies for persons with MR/DD (324,567 residents) , and c) the percentages of all residents of large and community (15 or fewer residents) residential settings who were living in places with ICF-MR certification on June 30, 1996.

A total of 44,340 persons were reported living in community ICFs-MR nationwide on June 30, 1996. These persons made up 34.3% of all ICF-MR residents on that day. However, states varied greatly in their particular use of large and community ICFs-MR. Use of community ICFs-MR on June 30, 1996 was dominated by eight states (California, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and Texas), each having 2,400 or more residents in community ICFs-MR, and together serving 75.2% of all community ICF-MR residents. Fourteen states had at least 50% of their total ICF-MR population in community facilities, while seven other states participating in the ICF-MR program had no residents in community ICFs-MR. Figure 3.3 shows these variations on a state-by-state basis.

The "Total Residents" columns of Table 3.3 present statistics on combined ICF-MR and non-ICF-MR (state and nonstate) residential services in the various states. It shows that nationally on June 30, 1996, over two-thirds (70.5%) of persons in all state and nonstate MR/DD residential programs were in residential settings with 15 or fewer residents. The "Percentage in ICF-MR" indicates the percentage of all MR/DD residential service recipients, by size of residential facility, who were living in facilities with ICF-MR certification. It shows that 39.9% of all MR/DD residential service recipients nationally were in ICFs-MR, but that only 19.4% of all people living in residential settings with 15 or fewer residents were living in ICFs-MR. In contrast, 89.3% of residents of large residential facilities lived in ICF-MR certified units. Figure 3.4 shows variations in utilization of ICF-MR services on a state-by-state basis. A total of nine states reported more than 60% of their total residential populations living in ICFs-MR on June 30, 1996. Thirteen states reported less than 20% of their residents in ICF-MR certified settings.

Table 3.3 Number and Percentage of Residents in ICF-MR Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State and Size

State	ICF-MR Residents						Total Residents						% of All Residents in ICF-MR				
	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	% in 1-15	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	% in 1-15	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL	0	23	23	800	823	3.0%	852	712	1,564	831	2,395	65.3%	0.0%	3.3%	1.6%	96.3%	34.4%
AK	20	20	40	19	59	67.8%	492	73	565	19	584	96.7%	4.1%	27.4%	7.1%	100.0%	10.1%
AZ	3	79	82	111	193	42.5%	2,403	108	2,511	186	2,697	93.1%	0.1%	73.1%	3.3%	59.7%	7.2%
AR	0	300	300	1,272	1,572	19.1%	512	823	1,335	1,496	2,822	47.3%	0.0%	36.5%	22.5%	85.0%	55.7%
CA	3,411	373	3,984	6,249	10,233	38.9%	31,804	2,927	34,731	9,147	43,878	79.2%	10.7%	19.6%	11.5%	68.3%	23.3%
CO	12	0	12	233	245	4.9%	2,939	593	3,532	233	3,755	93.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%	100.0%	6.5%
CT	399	253	652	646	1,298	50.2%	4,154	400	4,554	1,209	5,763	79.0%	9.6%	63.3%	14.3%	53.4%	22.5%
DE	0	16	16	284	300	5.3%	421	31	452	291	743	60.8%	0.0%	51.6%	3.5%	97.6%	40.4%
DC	421	333	754	0	754	100.0%	691	374	1,065	0	1,065	100.0%	60.9%	89.0%	70.8%	0.0%	70.8%
FL	238	0	238	3,204	3,442	6.9%	4,539	1,572	6,111	3,877	9,988	61.2%	5.2%	0.0%	3.9%	82.6%	34.5%
GA	0	0	0	2,019	2,019	0.0%	1,338	0	1,338	2,019	3,357	43.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	56.9%
HI	71	7	78	49	127	61.4%	1,070	7	1,077	63	1,140	94.5%	6.6%	100.0%	7.2%	77.8%	11.1%
ID	45	312	357	181	538	66.4%	1,208	321	1,729	442	2,171	79.6%	3.7%	59.9%	20.6%	41.0%	24.8%
IL	240	2,957	3,197	7,219	10,416	30.7%	2,416	3,442	5,858	7,219	13,077	44.8%	9.9%	85.9%	54.6%	100.0%	79.7%
IN	970	2,820	3,790	2,196	5,986	63.3%	2,356	2,820	5,176	2,228	7,404	70.7%	37.9%	100.0%	70.5%	98.6%	78.7%
IA	134	460	594	1,588	2,182	27.2%	2,831	1,994	4,825	3,223	8,048	60.0%	4.7%	23.1%	12.3%	49.3%	27.1%
KS	72	218	290	1,296	1,586	18.3%	546	851	1,377	1,406	2,783	49.5%	13.2%	26.3%	21.1%	92.2%	57.0%
KY	0	0	0	1,157	1,157	0.0%	1,002	234	1,236	1,173	2,409	51.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.6%	48.0%
LA	2,096	830	2,926	3,176	6,102	48.0%	3,176	1,187	4,363	3,648	8,011	54.5%	66.0%	69.9%	67.1%	87.1%	76.2%
ME	114	203	317	128	445	71.2%	1,098	310	1,398	149	1,547	90.4%	10.5%	65.5%	22.7%	85.9%	28.8%
MD	0	0	0	652	652	0.0%	3,948	353	4,201	726	4,927	85.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	89.8%	13.2%
MA	0	0	0	1,793	1,793	0.0%	6,093	1,364	7,457	1,824	9,281	80.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	98.4%	19.3%
MI	2,839	0	2,839	346	3,185	89.1%	11,557	0	11,557	346	11,903	97.1%	24.6%	0.0%	24.6%	100.0%	26.8%
MN	882	1,524	2,406	1,420	3,826	62.9%	7,896	1,674	9,570	1,420	10,990	87.1%	11.2%	91.0%	25.1%	100.0%	34.8%
MS	0	189	189	1,937	2,126	8.9%	467	202	739	2,049	2,788	27.0%	0.0%	84.7%	24.9%	94.5%	75.7%
MO	12	71	83	1,560	1,643	5.1%	2,984	1,313	4,299	3,319	6,518	66.0%	0.4%	5.4%	1.9%	70.3%	25.2%
MT	0	8	8	157	165	4.8%	839	501	1,340	157	1,497	89.5%	0.0%	1.6%	0.6%	100.0%	11.0%
NE	0	9	9	641	650	1.4%	1,453	240	1,693	641	2,334	72.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.5%	100.0%	27.8%
NV	63	19	82	150	232	35.3%	476	19	495	158	653	75.8%	13.2%	100.0%	16.6%	94.9%	35.5%
NH	0	0	0	22	22	0.0%	1,505	58	1,563	22	1,585	98.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1.4%
NJ	0	0	0	4,091	4,091	0.0%	4,505	533	5,038	4,931	9,969	50.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	83.0%	41.0%
NM	49	181	230	255	485	47.4%	1,692	181	1,783	255	2,038	87.5%	3.1%	100.0%	12.9%	100.0%	23.8%
NY	391	6,546	7,137	4,709	11,846	60.2%	11,946	17,562	29,508	4,808	34,316	86.0%	4.9%	37.3%	24.2%	97.9%	34.5%
NC	1,416	470	1,886	2,707	4,593	41.1%	3,646	731	4,397	2,786	7,183	61.2%	38.8%	62.0%	42.9%	97.2%	63.9%
ND	160	266	426	198	624	68.3%	1,122	503	1,625	262	1,887	86.1%	14.3%	52.9%	26.2%	75.6%	33.1%
OH	193	1,978	2,171	5,585	7,756	28.0%	4,619	3,099	9,718	5,773	15,491	62.7%	2.9%	63.8%	22.3%	96.7%	50.1%
OK	13	26	38	2,237	2,275	1.7%	1,523	363	1,786	2,237	4,023	44.4%	0.8%	9.9%	2.1%	100.0%	56.5%
OR	0	0	0	429	429	0.0%	2,718	561	3,279	621	3,900	84.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	69.1%	11.0%
PA	693	661	1,356	5,113	6,469	21.0%	9,817	738	10,555	5,549	16,104	65.5%	7.1%	90.8%	12.8%	92.1%	40.2%
RI	193	32	225	0	225	100.0%	978	337	1,315	0	1,315	100.0%	19.7%	9.5%	17.1%	0.0%	17.1%
SC	64	1,050	1,114	1,626	2,740	40.7%	1,650	1,087	2,737	1,626	4,363	62.7%	3.9%	96.6%	40.7%	100.0%	62.8%
SD	0	97	97	252	349	27.8%	989	684	1,673	252	1,925	86.9%	0.0%	14.2%	5.8%	100.0%	18.1%
TN	120	376	496	1,532	2,028	24.5%	1,216	1,461	2,677	1,532	4,209	63.6%	9.9%	25.7%	18.5%	100.0%	48.2%
TX	4,263	904	5,167	8,057	13,224	39.1%	4,263	904	5,167	8,057	13,224	39.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
UT	0	12	12	854	866	1.4%	1,241	276	1,517	854	2,371	64.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.8%	100.0%	36.5%
VT	15	0	15	0	15	100.0%	852	0	852	0	852	100.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%
VA	10	158	168	2,189	2,357	7.1%	471	713	1,184	2,189	3,373	35.1%	2.1%	22.2%	14.2%	100.0%	69.9%
WA	41	24	65	1,122	1,187	5.5%	4,442	400	4,842	1,504	6,346	76.3%	0.9%	6.0%	1.3%	74.6%	18.7%
WV	64	390	454	134	588	77.2%	1,122	666	1,788	174	1,962	91.1%	5.7%	58.6%	25.4%	77.0%	30.0%
WI	0	15	15	3,367	3,382	0.4%	7,872	830	8,702	3,367	12,069	72.1%	0.0%	1.8%	0.2%	100.0%	28.0%
WY	0	0	0	145	145	0.0%	599	75	674	145	819	82.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	17.7%
U.S. Total	19,928	24,413	44,340	85,109	129,449	34.3%	172,549	56,389	228,938	95,343	324,567	70.5%	11.5%	43.3%	19.4%	89.3%	39.9%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 3.3 Percentage of ICF-MR Residential Service Recipients in Settings with 15 or Fewer Residents on June 30, 1996



National Average = 34.3%

Figure 3.4 Percentage of All Residential Service Recipients in ICF-MR Certified Facilities on June 30, 1996



National Average = 39.9%

Figure 3.5 shows the number of people living in ICF-MR and non-ICF-MR residential settings of 1-15 and 16 or more total residents in June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996. This figure shows the decreasing role of ICFs-MR in residential services and the overall growth in the number of people living in community (15 or fewer residents) residential settings among both the ICFs-MR and non-ICF-MR residential settings. It also shows that while the ICF-MR program continues to be primarily concentrated in large facilities, there has been a gradual shift over time toward greater total and proportional use in community facilities. For example, in 1977, only 4.2% (1,710) of the total 40,400 persons in community residential settings were in ICFs-MR. In 1982, 15.7% (9,985) of 63,700 persons in community residential settings were in ICFs-MR. By 1987, 19.8% (23,528) of 118,570 residents in community residential settings were in ICFs-MR and at the highest point ever in 1993, a quarter (25.1%), or 48,669 of 193,747 total community setting residents, were living in ICFs-MR. In 1996 the 44,340 community ICF-MR residents were only 19.4% of all community residents. While in 1977 barely half (50.5%) of the people living in all state and nonstate facilities of 16 or more residents lived in ICFs-MR, by 1996, 89.3% of the people living in large facilities lived in ICFs-MR.

One notable change in ICF-MR utilization that is obvious in Figure 3.5 is the rapid growth in the non-ICF-MR component of residential services. In 1996, there were more persons receiving residential services in settings without ICF-MR certification than there were in 1977 when the efforts of states to maximize ICF-MR participation were still in process. Persons residing in settings without ICF-MR certification fell rapidly between 1977 and 1982 (from 141,600 to 103,000 people) as states made substantial efforts to increase federal financial participation in residential services through ICF-MR certification. Beginning in 1982 there has been a trend which has accelerated since 1987 for states to increase the number of persons with MR/DD living in settings without ICF-MR certification. From the 103,000 persons in residential settings without ICF-MR certification in 1982, persons living in non-certified settings grew to 111,353 in 1987 and 195,118 in 1996.

The primary factor promoting such change in state policy has been the Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) waiver option. Since authorization in Fiscal Year 1982 it has permitted states to provide residential services to persons living in community living arrangements and to receive Medicaid federal cost sharing of the residential services provided to them without accepting adherence to the ICF-MR standards for residential facilities. On June 30, 1996 an estimated 134,964 individuals with MR/DD were receiving HCBS financed residential services outside their natural or adoptive family home (see Table 3.11). In Fiscal Year 1996, therefore, HCBS surpassed ICF-MR as the most frequently used program of financing residential services for persons with MR/DD. Since 1982, the number of people receiving residential services that were not financed through the ICF-MR program increased from 103,000 to 195,118, but the estimated number of people receiving services financed by neither the ICF-MR program nor its HCBS alternative actually decreased by about 44,500 to an estimated 60,245 persons.

Expenditures for ICF-MR Services

Table 3.4 shows national totals and interstate variations on ICF-MR program recipients and expenditures for Fiscal Year 1996. Fiscal Year 1994 had been the first year since the implementation of the ICF-MR option within Medicaid that ICF-MR expenditures were essentially unchanged (increasing by less than 0.5%). It had been anticipated that actual reductions in ICF-MR expenditures might be evident in Fiscal Year 1995, especially given the reduction of over 7,000 ICF-MR residents between June 1994 and June 1995. However, ICF-MR expenditures in Fiscal Year 1995 were 9.67 billion dollars, an increase of 4.9% from 9.22 billion dollars in Fiscal Year 1994. In 1996, even though ICF-MR populations again decreased by nearly 5,000 persons, ICF-MR, expenditures again increased (to $9.73 billion), although the increase was only 2.1% more than Fiscal Year 1995 expenditures. Despite some growth in ICF-MR expenditures, clearly the levels of proportional increase that was of substantial policy concern in the 1980s has been greatly reduced. Between Fiscal Year 1971 when there were no ICF-MR expenditures and Fiscal Year 1977 ICF-MR expenditures grew to 1.1 billion dollars. Between 1977 and 1982 ICF-MR expenditures more than tripled from 1.1 billion dollars to 3.6 billion dollars. Although the rate of growth in ICF-MR expenditures slowed notably from Fiscal Year 1982 to Fiscal Year 1993, expenditures still increased by over 150% or 5.6 billion dollars, from 3.6 billion dollars in 1982 to 9.2 billion dollars in 1993. Despite a 3 year increase of only 5.8% in ICF-MR expenditures, these increases took place as total ICF-MR residents were reduced by 18,280 people. As a result average ICF-MR

expenditures per end of year ICF-MR resident increased between Fiscal Year 1993 and Fiscal Year 1996 from $62,180 to $75,192, or an average of 7% per person per year.

Before 1982 the ICF-MR program expenditures were pushed upward by both increased number of recipients and increased expenditures per recipient. Between 1982 and 1996 growing expenditures per recipient have been the single significant factor in the increasing expenditures for providing ICF-MR service. In fact, as has been noted, as the total number of ICF-MR residents actually decreased about 8% between June 30, 1982 and June 30, 1996 total ICF-MR expenditures have increased an average of 8% per year. Because a single factor (increasing costs per recipient) has been responsible for expenditure increases in the past decade, cost analysis has become much more straightforward. It also calmed concerns about the average annual increases of 20% in ICF-MR expenditures evident between 1972 and 1985, as a stable number of recipients has led to a considerably lower *rate* of growth. Of course, the decreases in ICF-MR residents in Fiscal Years 1994-1996, cannot be guaranteed to be an irrevocable pattern, given the wide scale disenchantment with the ICF-MR model as an appropriate and efficient way of providing community services, the increasing flexibility available to states in utilizing Medicaid HCBS for community residential services, and the likelihood of some substantial Medicaid reform policies that will make the extensive and expensive ICF-MR level of care more difficult for states to afford, it is difficult to imagine that ICF-MR utilization will not continue to decrease.

in addition to the changing utilization patterns, there has also been a substantial reduction in the past decade in the per resident rate of increase in expenditures for ICF-MR care. While per recipient expenditures between 1975 and 1982 increased from $5,530 to $25,590 per year, or at an average annual rate of about 29%, from 1982 to 1996 those increases were from $25,590 to $75,192, or about 13.8% annually. With cost inflation of the ICFs-MR substantially below the increases of other Medicaid services, for the most part attention now given to the program by federal and state policy makers is directed toward issues of the quality, equity, and system-wide effects of the program rather than what was perceived as runaway expenditures a decade ago. Indeed as will be shown subsequently, there has been a substantial decline in recent years in the proportion of total Medicaid expenditures attributed to the ICF-MR and HCBS programs for persons with MR/DD. However, at the state level cost management in ICF-MR services remains a major concern and opportunities to reallocate ICF-MR expenditures to more flexible and less costly HCBS and similar services have been of growing interest to states. Between 1992 and 1996 that interest was expressed in an explosive growth in HCBS enrollments (205% increase), and in efforts in New York, Massachusetts, and other states to simply "decertify" community ICFs-MR into Medicaid HCBS-financed residential sites (see Chapter 10).

Figure 3.5
Number of Residents in ICF-MR and Non ICF-MR Residential Settings with 1-15 and 16 or More Total Residents, 1977 to 1996

Table 3.4 Summary Statistics on ICF-MR Expenditures by State for Fiscal Year 1996 Using End of Year Recipients

State	ICF-MR Expenditures	Federal cost share	Total Federal ICF-MR Payments	Persons with MR/DD in ICFs-MR	ICF-MR Expenditures per Recipient	State Population (100,000)	Annual ICF-MR Expenditure per State Resident	State % of Federal ICF-MR
AL	$68,010,973	0.70	$47,505,665	825	$82,438	43.16	$15.76	0.86%
AK	$6,891,278	0.50	$3,445,639	59	$116,801	6.47	$10.65	0.06%
AZ	$17,791,589 e	0.66	$11,715,761	193	$92,184	41.45	$4.29	0.21%
AR	$105,334,764	0.74	$77,536,920	1,572	$67,007	24.90	$42.30	1.40%
CA	$471,048,580	0.50	$235,524,290	10,233	$46,032	328.96	$14.32	4.26%
CO	$24,164,734	0.52	$12,671,987	245	$98,632	37.80	$6.39	0.23%
CT	$180,935,584	0.50	$90,467,792	1,298	$139,396	32.73	$55.28	1.64%
DE	$30,886,227	0.50	$15,545,038	300	$102,954	7.26	$42.54	0.28%
DC	$60,969,212	0.50	$30,484,606	754	$80,861	5.55	$109.85	0.55%
FL	$226,117,681	0.56	$126,083,219	3,442	$65,694	144.31	$15.67	2.28%
GA	$125,847,831	0.62	$77,899,807	2,019	$62,332	72.09	$17.46	1.41%
HI	$11,237,754	0.50	$5,618,877	127	$88,486	12.42	$9.05	0.10%
ID	$40,571,755	0.69	$27,905,253	538	$75,412	11.83	$34.30	0.50%
IL	$591,718,863	0.50	$295,859,432	10,416	$56,809	119.16	$49.66	5.35%
IN	$308,112,560	0.63	$192,786,029	5,986	$51,472	58.65	$52.53	3.49%
IA	$178,843,930	0.64	$114,853,572	2,182	$81,963	28.75	$62.21	2.08%
KS	$98,690,009	0.59	$58,266,581	1,586	$62,226	26.25	$37.60	1.05%
KY	$58,064,778	0.70	$40,819,539	1,157	$50,186	38.79	$14.97	0.74%
LA	$312,379,849	0.72	$224,569,873	6,102	$51,193	43.83	$71.27	4.06%
ME	$49,475,852	0.63	$31,328,109	445	$111,182	12.37	$40.00	0.57%
MD	$63,594,028	0.50	$31,797,014	652	$97,537	51.27	$12.40	0.58%
MA	$276,184,625	0.50	$138,092,313	1,795	$153,863	59.71	$46.25	2.50%
MI	$192,725,978	0.57	$109,410,538	3,185	$60,511	96.12	$20.05	1.98%
MN	$183,855,005	0.54	$99,153,004	3,826	$48,054	46.60	$39.45	1.79%
MS	$101,925,115	0.78	$79,572,937	2,126	$47,942	26.83	$37.99	1.44%
MO	$156,510,293	0.60	$94,000,082	1,643	$95,259	53.16	$29.44	1.70%
MT	$14,747,406	0.69	$10,231,750	165	$89,378	8.74	$16.87	0.19%
NE	$36,497,943	0.59	$21,712,626	650	$56,151	16.56	$22.04	0.39%
NV	$23,737,030	0.50	$11,868,515	232	$102,315	15.20	$15.62	0.21%
NH	$3,290,787	0.50	$1,645,394	22	$149,581	11.39	$2.89	0.03%
NJ	$359,085,307	0.50	$179,542,654	4,091	$87,774	79.72	$45.04	3.25%
NM	$31,852,627	0.73	$23,211,009	485	$65,676	17.05	$18.68	0.42%
NY	$2,112,557,194	0.50	$1,056,278,597	11,846	$178,335	181.90	$116.14	19.11%
NC	$347,958,338	0.65	$224,746,291	4,593	$75,758	72.43	$48.04	4.07%
ND	$41,528,253	0.69	$28,679,412	624	$66,552	6.38	$65.09	0.52%
OH	$473,811,904	0.60	$285,092,623	7,756	$61,090	112.53	$42.11	5.16%
OK	$92,345,139	0.70	$64,540,018	2,275	$40,591	32.93	$28.04	1.17%
OR	$77,571,160	0.61	$47,326,165	429	$180,819	31.94	$24.29	0.86%
PA	$554,620,590	0.53	$293,560,678	6,469	$85,735	121.66	$45.59	5.31%
RI	$34,010,509	0.54	$18,311,258	225	$151,158	10.00	$34.01	0.33%
SC	$184,919,220	0.71	$130,867,332	2,740	$67,489	37.72	$49.02	2.37%
SD	$28,309,137	0.67	$18,870,871	349	$81,115	7.42	$38.15	0.34%
TN	$201,502,734	0.66	$132,266,395	2,028	$99,360	52.90	$38.09	2.39%
TX	$580,187,826	0.62	$361,457,016	13,224	$43,874	188.81	$30.73	6.54%
UT	$46,127,900	0.73	$33,770,236	866	$53,265	19.85	$23.24	0.61%
VT	$3,091,122	0.61	$1,881,566	15	$206,075	5.82	$5.31	0.03%
VA	$153,656,345	0.51	$78,933,264	2,357	$65,191	67.26	$22.85	1.43%
WA	$121,522,990	0.50	$60,992,389	1,187	$102,378	56.12	$21.65	1.10%
WV	$53,704,311	0.73	$39,343,778	588	$91,334	18.27	$29.39	0.71%
WI	$204,564,501	0.60	$122,063,638	3,382	$60,486	52.03	$39.32	2.21%
WY	$10,483,553	0.60	$6,257,633	145	$72,300	4.94	$21.22	0.11%
U. S. Total	$9,733,572,673		$5,526,364,981	129,449	$75,192	2,659.99	$36.59	100.00%

e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3.4a Summary Statistics on ICF-MR Expenditures Using Average Daily Residents by State for Fiscal Year 1996

State	ICF-MR Expenditures	Federal cost share	Total Federal ICF-MR Payments	Average Daily Residents with MR/DD in ICFs-MR	ICF-MR Expenditures per Recipient	State Population (100,000)	Annual ICF-MR Expenditure per State Resident	State % of Federal ICF-MR
AL	$68,010,973	0.70	$47,505,665	899	$75,694	43.16	$15.76	0.86%
AK	$6,891,278	0.50	$3,445,639	64	$108,524	6.47	$10.65	0.06%
AZ	$17,791,589 e	0.66	$11,715,761	197	$90,542	41.45	$4.29	0.21%
AR	$105,334,764	0.74	$77,536,920	1,568	$67,199	24.90	$42.30	1.40%
CA	$471,048,580	0.50	$235,524,290	11,179	$42,137	328.96	$14.32	4.26%
CO	$24,164,734	0.52	$12,671,987	276	$87,553	37.80	$6.39	0.23%
CT	$180,935,584	0.50	$90,467,792	1,282	$141,190	32.73	$55.28	1.64%
DE	$30,886,227	0.50	$15,545,038	307	$100,771	7.26	$42.54	0.28%
DC	$60,969,212	0.50	$30,484,606	754	$80,861	5.55	$109.85	0.55%
FL	$226,117,681	0.56	$126,083,219	3,486	$64,865	144.31	$15.67	2.28%
GA	$125,847,831	0.62	$77,899,807	1,950	$64,554	72.09	$17.46	1.41%
HI	$11,237,754	0.50	$5,618,877	130	$86,778	12.42	$9.05	0.10%
ID	$40,571,755	0.69	$27,905,253	539	$75,272	11.83	$34.30	0.50%
IL	$591,718,863	0.50	$295,859,432	10,676	$55,428	119.16	$49.66	5.35%
IN	$308,112,560	0.63	$192,786,029	6,081	$50,668	58.65	$52.53	3.49%
IA	$178,843,930	0.64	$114,853,572	2,046	$87,433	28.75	$62.21	2.08%
KS	$98,690,009	0.59	$58,266,581	1,614	$61,146	26.25	$37.60	1.05%
KY	$58,064,778	0.70	$40,819,539	1,179	$49,249	38.79	$14.97	0.74%
LA	$312,379,849	0.72	$224,569,873	6,073	$51,437	43.83	$71.27	4.06%
ME	$49,475,852	0.63	$31,328,109	466	$106,171	12.37	$40.00	0.57%
MD	$63,594,028	0.50	$31,797,014	714	$89,130	51.27	$12.40	0.58%
MA	$276,184,625	0.50	$138,092,313	1,893	$145,936	59.71	$46.25	2.50%
MI	$192,725,978	0.57	$109,410,538	3,280	$58,758	96.12	$20.05	1.98%
MN	$183,855,005	0.54	$99,153,004	4,141	$44,404	46.60	$39.45	1.79%
MS	$101,925,115	0.78	$79,572,937	2,093	$48,710	26.83	$37.99	1.44%
MO	$156,510,293	0.60	$94,000,082	1,661	$94,255	53.16	$29.44	1.70%
MT	$14,747,406	0.69	$10,231,750	165	$89,378	8.74	$16.87	0.19%
NE	$36,497,943	0.59	$21,712,626	664	$54,967	16.56	$22.04	0.39%
NV	$23,737,030	0.50	$11,868,515	223	$106,444	15.20	$15.62	0.21%
NH	$3,290,787	0.50	$1,645,394	47	$70,017	11.39	$2.89	0.03%
NJ	$359,085,307	0.50	$179,542,654	4,076	$88,108	79.72	$45.04	3.25%
NM	$31,852,627	0.73	$23,211,009	505	$63,075	17.05	$18.68	0.42%
NY	$2,112,557,194	0.50	$1,056,278,597	12,116	$174,361	181.90	$116.14	19.11%
NC	$347,958,338	0.65	$224,746,291	4,594	$75,742	72.43	$48.04	4.07%
ND	$41,528,253	0.69	$28,679,412	593	$70,090	6.38	$65.09	0.52%
OH	$473,811,904	0.60	$285,092,623	7,769	$60,991	112.53	$42.11	5.16%
OK	$92,345,139	0.70	$64,540,018	2,283	$40,458	32.93	$28.04	1.17%
OR	$77,571,160	0.61	$47,326,165	436	$178,120	31.94	$24.29	0.86%
PA	$554,620,590	0.53	$293,560,678	6,635	$83,596	121.66	$45.59	5.31%
RI	$34,010,509	0.54	$18,311,258	265	$128,384	10.00	$34.01	0.33%
SC	$184,919,220	0.71	$130,867,332	2,829	$65,377	37.72	$49.02	2.37%
SD	$28,309,137	0.67	$18,870,871	395	$71,760	7.42	$38.15	0.34%
TN	$201,502,734	0.66	$132,266,395	2,124	$94,892	52.90	$38.09	2.39%
TX	$580,187,826	0.62	$361,457,016	12,748	$45,512	188.81	$30.73	6.54%
UT	$46,127,900	0.73	$33,770,236	855	$53,982	19.85	$23.24	0.61%
VT	$3,091,122	0.61	$1,881,566	28	$110,397	5.82	$5.31	0.03%
VA	$153,656,345	0.51	$78,933,264	2,357	$65,205	67.26	$22.85	1.43%
WA	$121,522,990	0.50	$60,992,389	1,236	$98,359	56.12	$21.65	1.10%
WV	$53,704,311	0.73	$39,343,778	593	$90,564	18.27	$29.39	0.71%
WI	$204,564,501	0.60	$122,063,638	3,451	$59,285	52.03	$39.32	2.21%
WY	$10,483,553	0.60	$6,257,633	146	$71,805	4.94	$21.22	0.11%
U. S. Total	$9,733,572,673		$5,526,364,981	131,667	$73,926	2,659.99	$36.59	100.00%

e indicates estimate

Interstate Variations in ICF-MR Expenditures

Earlier in this chapter statistics were provided on the substantial interstate variations in the utilization of the ICF-MR option. Not surprisingly, there were also major variations in state expenditures for ICF-MR services. The variability in state ICF-MR expenditures, and federal contributions to those expenditures, is by no means predictable solely by general factors such as total ICF-MR residents or state size. Table 3.4 presents Fiscal Year 1996 statistics for ICF-MR expenditures across the states with respect to total expenditures, federal expenditures, per recipient average annual expenditures, per capita annual ICF-MR expenditures (ICF-MR expenditures per resident of the state), and each state's proportion of the total federal ICF-MR expenditures.

Per capita cost variations. One indicator of the variation among states in ICF-MR expenditures is the average expenditure for ICF-MR service per citizen of the state. Table 3.4 shows the great variation in these expenditures among the states. While nationally in Fiscal Year 1996 the average daily expenditure for ICF-MR services was $36.59 per U.S. citizen, the average varied from over three times the national average in the District of Columbia and New York to less than one-third the national average in 6 states (Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, New Hampshire, and Vermont). The variability in total and per citizen expenditures among states is affected by two major factors, the extent to which placements are made into ICF-MR facilities and the amount of expenditures per placement.

Variations due to disproportionate placements. Variations in ICF-MR utilization rates across states have an important direct effect on interstate differences in total expenditures and federal contributions to the total costs of residential programs in the various states. As an example of the variability, on June 30, 1996, nine states housed more than 60% of their total residential care population in ICF-MR certified facilities, and ten states housed 20% or less of their residents of state and nonstate residential settings in ICFs-MR. Obviously those states with disproportionately high placement rates into ICFs-MR tended to account for disproportionate amounts of total ICF-MR expenditures.

Variations due to differences in per recipient expenditures. Placement rates are not the only factor accounting for interstate differences in ICF-MR expenditures. Obviously the average number of dollars expended per ICF-MR resident is also a key factor. Table 3.4 also shows the enormous variations among states in the average per resident expenditures for ICF-MR services. The national average expenditures for ICF-MR services per recipient in Fiscal Year 1996 (total ICF-MR expenditures in the year divided by the number of average daily recipients in 1996) was $73,926 per year. Among the states with the highest per recipient expenditures in 1996 were Connecticut ($141,190), Massachusetts ($145,936),New York ($174,361), Oregon ($178,120), Rhode Island ($128,584) and Vermont ($110,397). Among the states with the lowest per recipient expenditures were California ($42,137), Kentucky ($49,249), Minnesota ($44,404), Mississippi ($48,710), Oklahoma ($40,458) and Texas ($46,512). The effects of relatively high per resident expenditures are straightforward. Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island and Vermont had 12.1% of all ICF-MR residents on June 30, 1996, but accounted for 27.6% of total Fiscal Year 1996 ICF-MR expenditures. Obviously, when a state is both a high user of the ICF-MR option and has high cost per recipient, its total expenditures become particularly notable. New York stands out in this regard. Although New York had only 6.8% of the total U.S. population and 9.2% of the ICF-MR population on June 30, 1996, it accounted for 21.7% of all ICF-MR expenditures.

Medicaid HCBS Recipients

The Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) program is associated with the ICF-MR program through its dedication to persons who but for the services available through the Medicaid HCBS program would be at risk of placement in an ICF-MR. Between enactment of the Medicaid HCBS program in 1981 and June 30, 1996 50 states chose to provide Home and Community Based Services as an alternative to ICF-MR services. This growth in state participation is shown in Table 3.5. As shown, at the end of the program's first year on June 30, 1982, there were 1,381 HCBS program participants. By June 30, 1987 there were 22,689 HCBS recipients. On June 30, 1992 there were 62,429 persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities receiving Medicaid Home and Community Based Services. In just 2 years between June 30, 1992 and June 30, 1994, states nearly

doubled again the number of HCBS recipients, with an increase of HCBS recipients to 122,075, an increase of 95.5%. In the 2 years between June 1994 and June 1996 HCBS recipients increased by another 55.8% to 190,230 persons. States with the greatest increase in total recipients over the six-year period between June 1990 to June 1996 were New York (27,272), California (25,505), Arizona (7,727) and Florida (7,385). Between June 1990 and June 1996, four-fifths of all states (41) more than doubled the number of their HCBS recipients.

Expenditures for HCBS Recipients

Table 3.6 shows national totals and interstate variations on HCBS recipients and expenditures for Fiscal Year 1996. Fiscal Year 1996, HCBS expenditures were 4.71 billion dollars for 190,230 end of year HCBS recipients. Fiscal Year 1996 expenditures divided by end of year HCBS recipients yielded an "average" cost per recipient of $24,783. In reality, however, when large number of persons are being added to the program during the fiscal year, this substantially underestimates the annualized average cost. Assuming persons were added to the total at an even rate all through the fiscal year, the annualized average HCBS expenditure would be computed best from the estimated number of HCBS participants at the mid-point of the fiscal year (about 169,708). This estimated number of HCBS participants would yield an annualized average expenditure of $27,780. The unadjusted "average" expenditure of $24,783 per recipient represents a 16.6% increase over June 30, 1990, when HCBS expenditures were 846 million dollars for 39,838 recipients ($21,246 per recipient). In addition to the substantial interstate variations in HCBS utilization noted earlier there were also major variations in state expenditures for HCBS participants. Table 3.6 presents Fiscal Year 1996 statistics for HCBS expenditures across states including total expenditures, federal expenditures, per participant average annual expenditures, per capita annual HCBS expenditures (HCBS expenditures per resident of the state), and each state's proportion of the federal HCBS expenditures.

Per capita cost variations. One indicator of the variation among states in HCBS expenditures is the average expenditure for HCBS per citizen of the state. Table 3.6 shows the great variation in these expenditures among the states. Nationally in Fiscal Year 1996 the average daily expenditure for HCBS per citizen was $17.72. The average varied from over three times the national average in four states (New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming) to one-third or less of the national average in 6 states (Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi, Nevada, and Texas). The variability in total and per citizen expenditures among states is affected by both the number of persons who received HCBS and the amount of money spent per recipient.

Variations due to disproportionate placements. Variations in HCBS utilization rates across states have an important direct effect on interstate differences in total and per capita expenditures. Nationally, on June 30, 1996, HCBS recipients were 59.5% of the total HCBS and ICF-MR recipient population. In five states HCBS recipients were 25% or less of the combined HCBS and ICF-MR recipient population, while in 17 states HCBS recipients were 75% or more of the total HCBS and ICF-MR recipient population.

Variations due to differences in per recipient expenditures. The average number of dollars expended per HCBS participant is also a key factor in interstate differences in HCBS expenditures. Table 3.6 shows the substantial variations among the states in the average per participant expenditures for HCBS. The national average expenditures for HCBS per recipient for Fiscal Year 1996 (total HCBS expenditures in the year divide by total recipients on June 30, 1996) was $24,783 per recipient.

Table 3.5 Summary Statistics on HCBS Recipients by State on June 30 of Years 1982 Through 1996

State	HCBS Recipients														
	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
AL	0	808	1,564	1,524	1,568	1,570	1,730	1,830	1,839	2,021	2,184	2,184 c	2,900 e	2,949	3,415
AK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	127	190
AZ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,794	4,832	6,071	6,773	7,117	7,727
AR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	196	415	453	429	469	472
CA	0	433	619	2,500	2,962	3,027	2,493	3,355	3,628	3,360	3,360	11,085	13,266	19,101	29,133
CO	0	0	600	920	1,280	1,389	1,621	1,679	1,841	1,993	2,204	2,407	2,684	3,316	3,976
CT	0	0	0	0	0	0	644	1,127	1,335	1,655	1,693	2,069	2,361	2,542	2,999
DE	0	0	0	50	78	81	144	100	196	245	290	290	310	356	352
DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL	0	0	7,003	7,003	1,003	2,631	2,631	2,542	2,615	2,631	2,637	6,009	6,430	7,988	10,000 e
GA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	160	353	359 e	359 e	556	848	1,619 e
HI	0	0	10	24	44	56	78	70	123	189	452	450	513	491	517
ID	0	0	18	51	25	55	201	270	346	165	225	174	333	362	415
IL	0	0	40	543	543	664	637	680	724	1,338	2,006	2,850	4,390	3,761	5,267
IN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447	529	594 e	816 e
IA	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	14	5	19	137	170	879	1,669 e	2,575 e
KS	0	0	23	186	173	135	185	314	361	497	555	1,066	1,339	1,613	3,146
KY	0	0	475	516	516	609	652	728	743	762	819	855 e	887 e	879 e	924 e
LA	0	2,006	2,046	2,087	0	0	0	0	0	56	939	1,134	1,543	1,926	2,100
ME	0	0	75	165	353	400	450	453	454	509	509 e	509	742	742	1,000
MD	0	0	28	356	464	685	716	813	858	1,082	1,972	2,437	2,787	2,898	3,306
MA	0	0	0	235	525	593	593	1,210	1,539	1,700	3,288	3,288	5,130	7,800	8,027
MI	0	0	0	0	2	3	580	1,292	1,658	2,122	2,741 e	2,885	3,367	3,842	5,207
MN	0	0	0	239	570	1,423	1,896	2,068	2,184	2,551	2,890	3,408	4,385	4,740	5,422
MS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
MO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338	989	1,452	2,241	2,622	3,057	3,511	5,685
MT	21	44	69	78	192	210	286	274	276	355	444	504	546	646	807
NE	0	0	0	0	0	0	553	540	658	683	710 e	991	1,257	1,169	1,834
NV	0	34	80	90	108	129	117	136	133	135	136	186	172	278	361
NH	0	0	303	409	504	541	634	762	822	955	1,059	1,032	1,303	1,570	1,906
NJ	0	0	1,317	2,025	1,993	2,596	2,873	3,170	3,270	3,655	3,971	4,191	4,729	5,033	5,242
NM	0	0	0	53	244	220	134	135	160	160	334	612	402	1,243	1,553
NY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	379	3,398	18,877	23,199	27,272
NC	0	0	17	120	331	328	405	553	731	780	939 e	1,190	1,318	1,818	3,098
ND	0	0	68	439	463	724	824	1,063	1,055	1,163	1,334	1,362	1,509 e	1,637	1,770 e
OH	0	0	56	62	86	100	134	240	245	246	397	1,120	2,399	2,593	2,593
OK	0	0	0	0	36	70	178	300	621	844	949	1,287	1,693	1,955	2,260
OR	1,360	1,886	1,992	973	572	832	968	1,218	1,282	2,177	1,458	2,023	2,136	2,500 e	2,523
PA	0	0	141	269	542	1,203	1,759	1,930	2,221	2,333	2,705	3,795	4,303	5,525	6,076
RI	0	0	11	25	117	136	250	449	277	793	993	1,192	1,333	1,304	1,914
SC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471	586	966	1,475	2,074
SD	0	382	457	523	498	596	610	683	721	788	852 e	923	1,004	1,157	1,295
TN	0	0	0	0	0	213	351	474	581	579	704 e	587	964	1,399	3,021
TX	0	0	0	0	70	70	412	417	485	973	968	968	1,564	2,728	3,658
UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,022	1,124	1,200	1,234	1,367 e	1,476	1,590	1,693 e	2,128
VT	0	11	74	116	234	196	248	280	323	485	413 e	398	722	913	1,107
VA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	326	537	537 e	715	1,126	1,453
WA	0	0	844	998	905	886	946	1,084	1,250	1,736	1,918 e	1,711	3,068	3,361	4,666
WV	0	0	22	55	55	124	124	234	316	413	513	637	803	1,121	1,337
WI	0	0	20	56	124	190	398	913	1,302	1,643	1,812	2,017	2,313	3,382	5,063
WY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	318	459	565	719	864
U.S. Total	1,381	5,604	17,972	22,690	17,180	22,689	28,689	35,077	39,838	51,271	62,429	86,604	122,073	149,185	190,230
Number of States with HCBS	2	8	27	31	32	35	38	40	42	45	48	48	49	49	51

Note: Data source for 1982-85 are from Smith & Gettings, 1992. e indicates estimate

Table 3.6 Summary Statistics on HCBS Expenditures by State for Fiscal Year 1996 Using End of Year Recipients

State	HCBS Expenditures	Federal cost share	Total Federal HCBS Payments	State % of Federal HCBS	Total HCBS Recipients	HCBS Expenditures per Recipient	State Population (100,000)	Annual HCBS Expenditure per state resident
AL	$45,690,044	0.70	$31,914,496	1.21%	3,415	$13,379	43.16	$10.59
AK	$7,071,179	0.50	$3,535,590	0.13%	190	$37,217	6.47	$10.93
AZ	$189,920,600	0.66	$125,062,715	4.73%	7,727	$24,579	41.45	$45.82
AR	$13,238,063	0.74	$9,744,538	0.37%	472	$28,047	24.90	$5.32
CA	$314,614,000	0.50	$157,307,000	5.95%	29,133	$10,799	328.96	$9.56
CO	$125,499,063	0.52	$65,811,709	2.49%	3,976	$31,564	37.80	$33.20
CT	$103,750,060	0.50	$51,875,030	1.96%	2,999	$34,595	32.73	$31.70
DE	$22,911,071	0.50	$11,531,142	0.44%	352	$65,088	7.26	$31.56
DC	$0	0.50	$0	0.00%	0	$0	5.55	$0.00
FL	$113,853,000	0.56	$63,484,433	2.40%	10,000	$11,385	144.31	$7.89
GA	$56,393,709 e	0.62	$34,907,706	1.32%	1,619	$34,832	72.09	$7.82
HI	$11,981,568 e	0.50	$5,990,784	0.23%	517	$23,175	12.42	$9.65
ID	$7,814,865 *	0.69	$5,375,064	0.20%	415	$18,831	11.83	$6.61
IL	$58,434,675	0.50	$29,217,338	1.10%	5,267	$11,094	119.16	$4.90
IN	$23,461,273 e	0.63	$14,679,719	0.56%	816	$28,752	58.65	$4.00
IA	$32,212,470	0.64	$20,686,848	0.78%	2,575	$12,510	28.75	$11.20
KS	$71,568,974	0.59	$42,254,322	1.60%	3,146	$22,749	26.25	$27.26
KY	$25,722,000	0.70	$18,082,566	0.68%	924	$27,838	38.79	$6.63
LA	$42,364,945	0.72	$30,456,159	1.15%	2,100	$20,174	43.83	$9.67
ME	$15,600,000	0.63	$9,877,920	0.37%	1,000	$15,600	12.37	$12.61
MD	$130,701,576 e	0.50	$65,350,788	2.47%	3,306	$39,535	51.27	$25.49
MA	$248,400,000	0.50	$124,200,000	4.70%	8,027	$30,946	59.71	$41.60
MI	$163,000,000 e	0.57	$92,535,100	3.50%	5,207	$31,304	96.12	$16.96
MN	$215,225,011	0.54	$116,070,848	4.39%	5,422	$39,695	46.60	$46.19
MS	$25,775	0.78	$20,123	0.00%	65	$397	26.83	$0.01
MO	$137,227,661	0.60	$82,418,933	3.12%	5,685	$24,139	53.16	$25.81
MT	$20,399,850	0.69	$14,153,416	0.54%	807	$25,279	8.74	$23.34
NE	$45,063,000	0.59	$26,807,979	1.01%	1,834	$24,571	16.56	$27.21
NV	$4,640,192	0.50	$2,320,096	0.09%	361	$12,854	15.20	$3.05
NH	$80,460,077	0.50	$40,230,039	1.52%	1,906	$42,214	11.39	$70.64
NJ	$154,968,000 e	0.50	$77,484,000	2.93%	5,242	$29,563	79.72	$19.44
NM	$71,840,073	0.73	$52,349,861	1.98%	1,553	$46,259	17.05	$42.13
NY	$728,613,813 e	0.50	$364,306,907	13.78%	27,272	$26,717	181.90	$40.06
NC	$56,651,028	0.65	$36,590,899	1.38%	3,098	$18,286	72.43	$7.82
ND	$28,924,495 e	0.69	$19,975,256	0.76%	1,770	$16,342	6.38	$45.34
OH	$97,365,161	0.60	$58,584,617	2.22%	2,593	$37,549	112.53	$8.65
OK	$104,988,447 e	0.70	$73,376,426	2.77%	2,260	$46,455	32.93	$31.88
OR	$99,133,716	0.61	$60,481,480	2.29%	2,523	$39,292	31.94	$31.04
PA	$340,698,937	0.53	$180,331,947	6.82%	6,076	$56,073	121.66	$28.00
RI	$80,600,000 e	0.54	$43,395,040	1.64%	1,914	$42,111	10.00	$80.60
SC	$32,600,000	0.71	$23,071,020	0.87%	2,074	$15,718	37.72	$8.64
SD	$33,903,140	0.67	$22,599,833	0.85%	1,295	$26,180	7.42	$45.69
TN	$71,431,397	0.66	$46,887,569	1.77%	3,021	$23,645	52.90	$13.50
TX	$82,982,512	0.62	$51,698,105	1.95%	3,658	$22,685	188.81	$4.40
UT	$40,827,000 e	0.73	$29,889,447	1.13%	2,128	$19,186	19.85	$20.57
VT	$45,137,783	0.61	$27,475,369	1.04%	1,107	$40,775	5.82	$77.56
VA	$50,479,113	0.51	$25,931,120	0.98%	1,453	$34,741	67.26	$7.51
WA	$97,771,853	0.50	$49,071,693	1.86%	4,666	$20,954	56.12	$17.42
WV	$36,075,324	0.73	$26,428,782	1.00%	1,337	$26,982	18.27	$19.75
WI	$103,000,000	0.60	$61,460,100	2.32%	5,063	$20,344	52.03	$19.80
WY	$29,157,556	0.60	$17,404,145	0.66%	864	$33,747	4.94	$59.02
U. S. Total	$4,714,394,049		$2,644,696,016	100.00%	190,230	$24,783	2,659.99	$17.72

e indicates estimate

* Idaho amended its waiver effective 7/1/95 to include 12 additional services

Table 3.6a Summary Statistics on HCBS Expenditures by State for Fiscal Year 1996 Using Average Daily Recipients

State	HCBS Expenditures	Federal cost share	Total Federal HCBS Payments	State % of Federal HCBS	Average Daily HCBS Recipients	HCBS Expenditures per Recipient	State Population (100,000)	Annual HCBS Expenditure per state resident
AL	$45,690,044	0.70	$31,914,496	1.21%	3,182	$14,359	43.16	$10.59
AK	$7,071,179	0.50	$3,535,590	0.13%	159	$44,613	6.47	$10.93
AZ	$189,920,600	0.66	$125,062,715	4.73%	7,422	$25,589	41.45	$45.82
AR	$13,238,063	0.74	$9,744,538	0.37%	471	$28,136	24.90	$5.32
CA	$314,614,000	0.50	$157,307,000	5.95%	24,117	$13,045	328.96	$9.56
CO	$125,499,063	0.52	$65,811,709	2.49%	3,646	$34,421	37.80	$33.20
CT	$103,750,060	0.50	$51,875,030	1.96%	2,771	$37,448	32.73	$31.70
DE	$22,911,071	0.50	$11,531,142	0.44%	354	$64,721	7.26	$31.56
DC	$0	0.50	$0	0.00%	0	$0	5.55	$0.00
FL	$113,853,000	0.56	$63,484,433	2.40%	8,994	$12,659	144.31	$7.89
GA	$56,393,709 e	0.62	$34,907,706	1.32%	1,234	$45,718	72.09	$7.82
HI	$11,981,568 e	0.50	$5,990,784	0.23%	504	$23,773	12.42	$9.63
ID	$7,814,865 *	0.69	$5,375,064	0.20%	389	$20,113	11.83	$6.61
IL	$58,434,675	0.50	$29,217,338	1.10%	4,514	$12,945	119.16	$4.90
IN	$23,461,273 e	0.63	$14,679,719	0.56%	705	$33,278	58.65	$4.00
IA	$32,212,470	0.64	$20,686,848	0.78%	2,122	$15,180	28.75	$11.20
KS	$71,568,974	0.59	$42,254,322	1.60%	2,380	$30,077	26.25	$27.26
KY	$25,722,000	0.70	$18,082,566	0.68%	902	$28,532	38.79	$6.63
LA	$42,364,945	0.72	$30,456,159	1.15%	2,013	$21,046	43.83	$9.67
ME	$15,600,000	0.63	$9,877,920	0.37%	871	$17,910	12.37	$12.61
MD	$130,701,576 e	0.50	$65,350,788	2.47%	3,102	$42,135	51.27	$25.49
MA	$248,400,000	0.50	$124,200,000	4.70%	7,914	$31,389	59.71	$41.60
MI	$163,000,000 e	0.57	$92,535,100	3.50%	4,525	$36,026	96.12	$16.96
MN	$215,225,011	0.54	$116,070,848	4.39%	5,081	$42,359	46.60	$46.19
MS	$25,775	0.78	$20,123	0.001%	33	$793	26.83	$0.01
MO	$137,227,661	0.60	$82,418,933	3.12%	4,598	$29,845	53.16	$25.81
MT	$20,399,850	0.69	$14,153,416	0.54%	727	$28,080	8.74	$23.34
NE	$45,063,000	0.59	$26,807,979	1.01%	1,502	$30,012	16.56	$27.21
NV	$4,640,192	0.50	$2,320,096	0.09%	320	$14,523	15.20	$3.05
NH	$80,460,077	0.50	$40,230,039	1.52%	1,738	$46,295	11.39	$70.64
NJ	$154,968,000 e	0.50	$77,484,000	2.93%	5,138	$30,164	79.72	$19.44
NM	$71,840,073	0.73	$52,349,861	1.98%	1,398	$51,388	17.05	$42.13
NY	$728,613,813 e	0.50	$364,306,907	13.78%	25,236	$28,873	181.90	$40.06
NC	$56,651,028	0.65	$36,590,899	1.38%	2,458	$23,048	72.43	$7.82
ND	$28,924,495 e	0.69	$19,975,256	0.76%	1,704	$16,979	6.38	$45.34
OH	$97,365,161	0.60	$58,584,617	2.22%	2,593	$37,549	112.53	$8.65
OK	$104,988,447 e	0.70	$73,376,426	2.77%	2,108	$49,817	32.93	$31.88
OR	$99,133,716	0.61	$60,481,480	2.29%	2,512	$39,472	31.94	$31.04
PA	$340,698,937	0.53	$180,331,947	6.82%	5,801	$58,736	121.66	$28.00
RI	$80,600,000 e	0.54	$43,395,040	1.64%	1,609	$50,093	10.00	$80.60
SC	$32,600,000	0.71	$23,071,020	0.87%	1,775	$18,371	37.72	$8.64
SD	$33,903,140	0.67	$22,599,833	0.85%	1,226	$27,653	7.42	$45.69
TN	$71,431,397	0.66	$46,887,569	1.77%	2,210	$32,322	52.90	$13.50
TX	$82,982,512	0.62	$51,698,105	1.95%	3,193	$25,989	188.81	$4.40
UT	$40,827,000 e	0.73	$29,889,447	1.13%	1,911	$21,370	19.85	$20.57
VT	$45,137,783	0.61	$27,475,369	1.04%	1,010	$44,691	5.82	$77.56
VA	$50,479,113	0.51	$25,931,120	0.98%	1,290	$39,146	67.26	$7.51
WA	$97,771,853	0.50	$49,071,693	1.86%	4,014	$24,361	56.12	$17.42
WV	$36,075,324	0.73	$26,428,782	1.00%	1,229	$29,353	18.27	$19.75
WI	$103,000,000	0.60	$61,460,100	2.32%	4,223	$24,393	52.03	$19.80
WY	$29,157,556	0.60	$17,404,145	0.66%	792	$36,838	4.94	$59.02
U. S. Total	$4,714,394,049		$2,644,696,016	100.00%	169,708	$27,780	2,659.99	$17.72

e indicates estimate

* Idaho amended its waiver effective 7/1/95 to include 12 additional services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

year. Among the states with the highest per recipient expenditures in 1996 were Delaware ($65,088), Pennsylvania ($56,073), New Hampshire ($42,214), New Mexico ($46,259) and Oklahoma ($46,455). Among the states with the lowest per recipient expenditures were California ($10,799), Florida ($11,385), Illinois ($11,094) and Mississippi ($397).

The effects of relatively high per resident expenditures are straightforward. Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, New Mexico and Oklahoma accounted for 6.4% of all HCBS recipients on June 30, 1996, but accounted for 13.2% of total Fiscal Year 1996 HCBS expenditures.

HCBS Recipients and Residents of Community ICFs-MR

Medicaid long-term care services for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities were long criticized for being primarily institutional in orientation. The utilization of the HCBS program and the development of community ICFs-MR has substantially changed that situation within the past decade, although "institutional" is obviously not exclusively dictated by facility size. Table 3.7 presents statistics on states' use of the Medicaid HCBS option on June 30, 1996 and summarizes the combined use of the Medicaid HCBS and community ICF-MR options to provide community services, as well as the total use of ICF-MR and waiver services by the individual states.

Table 3.7 shows that on June 30, 1996 there were 190,230 people receiving Medicaid HCBS services and 44,340 persons living in community ICFs-MR. This combined total of community Medicaid service recipients (234,570) was almost three-fourths (73.4%) of the 319,679 total of all HCBS recipients and residents of all sizes of ICF-MR. Combining HCBS and community ICF-MR service recipients also shows 45 states to be serving the majority of their recipients of Title XIX services for persons with MR/DD in community programs. More than one-half of all states (28) were serving three-quarters or more of their Title XIX service recipients in community settings. Figure 3.6 shows this variation on a state-by-state basis.

Figure 3.7 shows the total large (16 or more residents) state and nonstate ICF-MR residents and community state and nonstate ICF-MR residents and HCBS recipients for 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996. It shows the dramatic increase in community Title XIX service recipients from 1977 to 1996, from 1,710 to 319,679 It also shows the substantial decrease of the population of large ICFs-MR from 1982 to 1996, from 130,767 to 85,109.

Table 3.7 ICF-MR Residents and Medicaid Home and Community Based Service (HCBS) Recipients with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities on June 30, 1996 by State

State	Total HCBS Recipients	Residents of Community ICFs-MR	Residents of HCBS & Community ICFs-MR	Residents of All ICFs-MR	ICF-MR & HCBS Recipients	Community ICF-MR & HCBS as % of All ICF-MR & HCBS Recipients
AL	3,415	25	3,440	825	4,240	81.1%
AK	190	40	230	59	249	92.4%
AZ	7,727	82	7,809	193	7,920	98.6%
AR	472	300	772	1,572	2,044	37.8%
CA	29,133	3,984	33,117	10,233	39,366	84.1%
CO	3,976	12	3,988	245	4,221	94.5%
CT	2,999	652	3,651	1,298	4,297	85.0%
DE	352	16	368	300	652	56.4%
DC	0	754	754	754	754	100.0%
FL	10,000	238	10,238	3,442	13,442	76.2%
GA	1,619	0	1,619	2,019	3,638	44.5%
HI	517	78	595	127	644	92.4%
ID	415	357	772	538	953	81.0%
IL	5,267	3,197	8,464	10,416	15,683	54.0%
IN	816	3,790	4,606	5,986	6,802	67.7%
IA	2,575	594	3,169	2,182	4,757	66.6%
KS	3,146	290	3,436	1,586	4,732	72.6%
KY	924	0	924	1,157	2,081	44.4%
LA	2,100	2,926	5,026	6,102	8,202	61.3%
ME	1,000	317	1,317	445	1,445	91.1%
MD	3,306	0	3,306	652	3,958	83.5%
MA	8,027	0	8,027	1,795	9,822	81.7%
MI	5,207	2,839	8,046	3,185	8,392	95.9%
MN	5,422	2,406	7,828	3,826	9,248	84.6%
MS	65	189	254	2,126	2,191	11.6%
MO	5,685	83	5,768	1,643	7,328	78.7%
MT	807	8	815	165	972	83.8%
NE	1,834	9	1,843	650	2,484	74.2%
NV	361	82	443	232	593	74.7%
NH	1,906	0	1,906	22	1,928	98.9%
NJ	5,242	0	5,242	4,091	9,333	56.2%
NM	1,553	230	1,783	485	2,038	87.5%
NY	27,272	7,137	34,409	11,846	39,118	88.0%
NC	3,098	1,886	4,984	4,593	7,691	64.8%
ND	1,770	426	2,196	624	2,394	91.7%
OH	2,593	2,171	4,764	7,756	10,349	46.0%
OK	2,260	38	2,298	2,275	4,535	50.7%
OR	2,523	0	2,523	429	2,952	85.5%
PA	6,076	1,356	7,432	6,469	12,545	59.2%
RI	1,914	225	2,139	225	2,139	100.0%
SC	2,074	1,114	3,188	2,740	4,814	66.2%
SD	1,295	97	1,392	349	1,644	84.7%
TN	3,021	496	3,517	2,028	5,049	69.7%
TX	3,658	5,167	8,825	13,224	16,882	52.3%
UT	2,128	12	2,140	866	2,994	71.5%
VT	1,107	15	1,122	15	1,122	100.0%
VA	1,453	168	1,621	2,357	3,810	42.5%
WA	4,666	65	4,731	1,187	5,853	80.8%
WV	1,337	454	1,791	588	1,925	93.0%
WI	5,063	15	5,078	3,382	8,445	60.1%
WY	864	0	864	145	1,009	85.6%
U.S. Total	190,230	44,340	234,570	129,449	319,679	73.4%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 3.6 Community ICF-MR & HCBS Recipients as a Percentage of All ICF-MR & HCBS Recipients on June 30, 1996



136

National Average = 73.4%

131

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ICF-MR and HCBS Recipients and Expenditures

Medicaid Intermediate Care Facilities (ICFs-MR) and Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) for persons with MR/RC share common eligibility criteria and are intended to serve the same general population. Yet, as reported in Table 3.8, expenditures for ICF-MR and HCBS services tend to be disproportionately higher in the former. In 1996, nationally, HCBS recipients made up 59.5% of the total HCBS and ICF-MR recipient population but were beneficiaries of only 32.6% of total HCBS and ICF-MR expenditures.

HCBS and ICF-MR recipients and expenditures varied among individual states but in every state the HCBS share of total expenditures was disproportionately low when measured against the HCBS share of total recipient population. In 14 states, (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee), HCBS recipients as a proportion of all recipients exceeded HCBS expenditures as a proportion of all expenditures by a factor of 2 or greater; in four of those states (Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi, Nevada) by a factor of 3 or greater.

Direct comparisons of the costs of ICF-MR and HCBS approaches to financing residential services are complicated by a number of factors. In some states, disproportionately higher expenditures for ICF-MR recipients may be explained by artificially inflated institutional costs resulting from deinstitutionalization. The consistent pattern of relatively lower expenditures for HCBS recipients in some states, is an intended and controlled consequence of an effort to achieve cost containment in Medicaid spending. In such states HCBS expenditures are limited in reference to ICF-MR expenditures. In almost all states some HCBS recipients live in their family homes (an estimated 29% nationally) which reduces long-term care costs by the relative value of the supports provided in the home and community by family members and other non-paid support providers. Somewhat related, children and youth are more likely to be served under HCBS than ICF-MR and as a result "day program" costs are more likely to be covered by educational agencies. In addition, although federal regulations require that both HCBS and ICF-MR recipients meet the same eligibility criteria and level of care needs, in actual practice in some states HCBS has become defined as a less intensive service than ICF-MR in a "continuum" of Medicaid long term care services, with large institutions seen as most restrictive and smaller community ICFs-MR at intermediate points of intensity. As a result, HCBS is in some states, almost by definition, less costly than ICF-MR. Finally, because Medicaid law specifically prohibits HCBS financing of room and board costs HCBS recipients typically pay for such costs through their social security disability cash benefits. These individual "contributions" to room and board represent approximately $5,000 per HCBS recipient per year, and can be even higher because of state supplements.

Figure 3.7 Residents of Settings with 15 or Fewer and 16 or More Residents Among Medicaid ICF-MR and HCBS Recipients on June 30, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1996



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3.8 ICF-MR Residents and HCBS Recipients and ICF-MR and HCBS Expenditures on June 30 ,1996 by State

State	Total Recipients of ICF-MR & HCBS	ICF-MR & HCBS Expenditures	% of Recipients		% of Expenditures	
			HCBS	ICF-MR	HCBS	ICF-MR
AL	4,240	$113,701,017	80.5%	19.5%	40.2%	59.8%
AK	249	$13,962,457	76.3%	23.7%	50.6%	49.4%
AZ	7,920	$207,712,189	97.6%	2.4%	91.4%	8.6%
AR	2,044	$118,572,827	23.1%	76.9%	11.2%	88.8%
CA	39,366	$785,662,580	74.0%	26.0%	40.0%	60.0%
CO	4,221	$149,663,797	94.2%	5.8%	83.9%	16.1%
CT	4,297	$284,685,644	69.8%	30.2%	36.4%	63.6%
DE	652	$53,797,298	54.0%	46.0%	42.6%	57.4%
DC	754	$60,969,212	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
FL	13,442	$339,970,681	74.4%	25.6%	33.5%	66.5%
GA	3,638	$182,241,540	44.5%	55.5%	30.9%	69.1%
HI	644	$23,219,322	80.3%	19.7%	51.6%	48.4%
ID	953	$48,386,620	43.5%	56.5%	16.2%	83.8%
IL	15,683	$650,153,538	33.6%	66.4%	9.0%	91.0%
IN	6,802	$331,573,833	12.0%	88.0%	7.1%	92.9%
IA	4,757	$211,056,400	54.1%	45.9%	15.3%	84.7%
KS	4,732	$170,258,983	66.5%	33.5%	42.0%	58.0%
KY	2,081	$83,786,778	44.4%	55.6%	30.7%	69.3%
LA	8,202	$354,744,794	25.6%	74.4%	11.9%	88.1%
ME	1,445	$65,075,852	69.2%	30.8%	24.0%	76.0%
MD	3,958	$194,295,604	83.5%	16.5%	67.3%	32.7%
MA	9,822	$524,584,625	81.7%	18.3%	47.4%	52.6%
MI	8,392	$355,725,978	62.0%	38.0%	45.8%	54.2%
MN	9,248	$399,080,016	58.6%	41.4%	53.9%	46.1%
MS	2,191	$101,950,890	3.0%	97.0%	0.0%	100.0%
MO	7,328	$293,737,954	77.6%	22.4%	46.7%	53.3%
MT	972	$35,147,256	83.0%	17.0%	58.0%	42.0%
NE	2,484	$81,560,943	73.8%	26.2%	55.3%	44.7%
NV	593	$28,377,222	60.9%	39.1%	16.4%	83.6%
NH	1,928	$83,750,864	98.9%	1.1%	96.1%	3.9%
NJ	9,333	$514,053,307	56.2%	43.8%	30.1%	69.9%
NM	2,038	$103,692,700	76.2%	23.8%	69.3%	30.7%
NY	39,118	$2,841,171,007	69.7%	30.3%	25.6%	74.4%
NC	7,691	$404,609,366	40.3%	59.7%	14.0%	86.0%
ND	2,394	$70,452,748	73.9%	26.1%	41.1%	58.9%
OH	10,349	$571,177,065	25.1%	74.9%	17.0%	83.0%
OK	4,535	$197,333,586	49.8%	50.2%	53.2%	46.8%
OR	2,952	$176,704,876	85.5%	14.5%	56.1%	43.9%
PA	12,545	$895,319,527	48.4%	51.6%	38.1%	61.9%
RI	2,139	$114,610,509	89.5%	10.5%	70.3%	29.7%
SC	4,814	$217,519,220	43.1%	56.9%	15.0%	85.0%
SD	1,644	$62,212,277	78.8%	21.2%	54.5%	45.5%
TN	5,049	$272,934,131	59.8%	40.2%	26.2%	73.8%
TX	16,882	$663,170,338	21.7%	78.3%	12.5%	87.5%
UT	2,994	$86,954,900	71.1%	28.9%	47.0%	53.0%
VT	1,122	$48,228,905	98.7%	1.3%	93.6%	6.4%
VA	3,810	$204,135,458	38.1%	61.9%	24.7%	75.3%
WA	5,853	$219,294,843	79.7%	20.3%	44.6%	55.4%
WV	1,925	$89,779,635	69.5%	30.5%	40.2%	59.8%
WI	8,445	$307,564,501	60.0%	40.0%	33.5%	66.5%
WY	1,009	$39,641,109	85.6%	14.4%	73.6%	26.4%
U.S. Total	319,679	$14,447,966,722	59.5%	40.5%	32.6%	67.4%

Table 3.9 Summary of Combined ICF-MR and HCBS Contributions and State Benefit Ratios by State for Fiscal Year 1996

State	Federal ICF-MR Expenditures	Federal HCBS Expenditures	State % of Federal ICF-MR & HCBS	Federal Income Tax (Millions)*	State % Total Income Tax	State Medicaid Benefit Ratio
AL	$47,505,665	$31,914,496	0.97%	$6,448	1.22%	0.80
AK	$3,445,639	$3,535,590	0.09%	$1,551	0.29%	0.29
AZ	$11,715,761	$125,062,715	1.67%	$6,701	1.27%	1.32
AR	$77,536,920	$9,744,538	1.07%	$3,250	0.61%	1.74
CA	$235,524,290	$157,307,000	4.81%	$63,907	12.08%	0.40
CO	$12,671,987	$65,811,709	0.96%	$8,136	1.54%	0.62
CT	$90,467,792	$51,875,030	1.74%	$11,443	2.16%	0.81
DE	$15,545,038	$11,531,142	0.33%	$1,572	0.30%	1.11
DC	$30,484,606	$0	0.37%	$1,620	0.31%	1.22
FL	$126,083,219	$63,484,433	2.32%	$29,539	5.59%	0.42
GA	$77,899,807	$34,907,706	1.38%	$12,947	2.45%	0.56
HI	$5,618,877	$5,990,784	0.14%	$2,507	0.47%	0.30
ID	$27,905,253	$5,375,064	0.41%	$1,719	0.33%	1.25
IL	$295,859,432	$29,217,338	3.98%	$28,530	5.39%	0.74
IN	$192,786,029	$14,679,719	2.54%	$10,883	2.06%	1.23
IA	$114,853,572	$20,686,848	1.66%	$4,648	0.88%	1.89
KS	$58,266,581	$42,254,322	1.23%	$4,749	0.90%	1.37
KY	$40,819,539	$18,082,566	0.72%	$5,603	1.06%	0.68
LA	$224,569,873	$30,456,159	3.12%	$6,345	1.20%	2.60
ME	$31,328,109	$9,877,920	0.50%	$1,896	0.36%	1.41
MD	$31,797,014	$65,350,788	1.19%	$11,904	2.25%	0.53
MA	$138,092,313	$124,200,000	3.21%	$15,514	2.93%	1.09
MI	$109,410,538	$92,535,100	2.47%	$19,234	3.64%	0.68
MN	$99,153,004	$116,070,848	2.63%	$9,577	1.81%	1.45
MS	$79,572,937	$20,123	0.97%	$3,090	0.58%	1.67
MO	$94,000,082	$82,418,933	2.16%	$9,501	1.80%	1.20
MT	$10,231,750	$14,153,416	0.30%	$1,243	0.24%	1.27
NE	$21,712,626	$26,807,979	0.59%	$2,814	0.53%	1.12
NV	$11,868,515	$2,320,096	0.17%	$3,832	0.72%	0.24
NH	$1,645,394	$40,230,039	0.51%	$2,697	0.51%	1.00
NJ	$179,542,654	$77,484,000	3.15%	$23,617	4.47%	0.70
NM	$23,211,009	$52,349,861	0.92%	$2,314	0.44%	2.11
NY	$1,056,278,597	$364,306,907	17.39%	$45,165	8.54%	2.04
NC	$224,746,291	$36,590,899	3.20%	$11,992	2.27%	1.41
ND	$28,679,412	$19,975,256	0.60%	$1,030	0.19%	3.06
OH	$285,092,623	$58,584,617	4.21%	$20,993	3.97%	1.06
OK	$64,540,018	$73,376,426	1.69%	$4,701	0.89%	1.90
OR	$47,326,165	$60,481,480	1.32%	$5,584	1.06%	1.25
PA	$293,560,678	$180,331,947	5.80%	$24,176	4.57%	1.27
RI	$18,311,258	$43,395,040	0.76%	$1,975	0.37%	2.02
SC	$130,867,332	$23,071,020	1.88%	$5,327	1.01%	1.87
SD	$18,870,871	$22,599,833	0.51%	$1,231	0.23%	2.18
TN	$132,266,395	$46,887,569	2.19%	$9,344	1.77%	1.24
TX	$361,457,016	$51,698,105	5.06%	$35,015	6.62%	0.76
UT	$33,770,236	$29,889,447	0.78%	$2,788	0.53%	1.48
VT	$1,881,566	$27,475,369	0.36%	$988	0.19%	1.92
VA	$78,933,264	$25,931,120	1.28%	$14,151	2.68%	0.48
WA	$60,992,389	$49,071,693	1.35%	$12,132	2.29%	0.59
WV	$39,343,778	$26,428,782	0.80%	$2,328	0.44%	1.83
WI	$122,063,638	$61,460,100	2.25%	$9,625	1.82%	1.23
WY	$6,257,633	$17,404,145	0.29%	$968	0.18%	1.58
U.S. Total	$5,526,364,981	$2,644,696,016	100.00%	$528,844	100.00%	1.00

* indicates 1993 Data

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Variations in State Financial Benefit for Combined ICF-MR and HCBS Programs

As in all Medicaid programs, the federal government shares the costs of the ICF-MR and HCBS programs with the states as a function of the state per capita income relative to national per capita income (see Table 3.6 for 1996 federal contributions or "match" rates). Relatively rich states share total expenditures on an equal basis with the federal government; relatively poor states may have federal involvement in financing Medicaid services up to 83% (Mississippi's 78.0% was the highest federal share in 1996). It is often presumed, therefore, that the extent to which states benefit from ICF-MR and HCBS program participation should to be related to their general need for assistance as reflected in the federal Medicaid cost share ratio. However, because states vary considerably in their combined ICF-MR and HCBS utilization rates, in the proportions of ICF-MR and HCBS recipients, and in their expenditures per recipient, some deviation is expected between total benefit in federal dollars from the combined ICF-MR and HCBS program and the proportion of total ICF-MR and HCBS expenditures reimbursed by the federal government. This concept of relative benefit has become of increasing interest recently in discussions of Medicaid "block grants" or other means of capping states' abilities to spend federal monies. Questions arise as to whether state funding allocations should be based on present Medicaid expenditures, including relative "benefit" disparities to be noted, or whether they should be based on separate criteria (e.g., total persons served, percentage of state population in poverty), and, if the former, whether some adjustment would be needed over time to close the gap between states that presently receive relatively more or less federal Medicaid reimbursements.

To demonstrate the differences that exist among states in their relative "return" on current contributions to Medicaid, a "state benefit ratio" was computed. The state Medicaid benefit ratio in Table 3.9 represents a ratio of combined federal ICF-MR and HCBS reimbursements paid to each state for each dollar contributed to the program through personal income tax. Obviously such an index masks certain realities: first, federal revenues for the Medicaid program do not come exclusively through personal income tax; second, expenditures for federal programs fall short of the revenues generated for those programs (i.e., the federal government has had substantially greater total expenditures than revenues), a major factor in the block grant and other proposals to control expenditures. Despite the oversimplifications, such an index is one way of assessing the balance between state contributions to the federal government for the combined ICF-MR and HCBS programs and federal reimbursements back to the states for ICF-MR and HCBS programs.

Table 3.9 shows that in Fiscal Year 1996, 6 states got back over two dollars in federal reimbursements for every dollar contributed. In contrast 6 states got back $.50 or less in reimbursements for every dollar contributed. Of the 33 states showing a favorable "State Benefit Ratio" (state's % of total federal ICF-MR reimbursements divided by state's % of total federal income tax payments being greater than 1.00), 8 of the 10 poorest states (with federal Medicaid matching rates of 70% or greater) were included. Only 5 of the fourteen richest states with federal Medicaid matching rates of 50.0% had a favorable "state benefit ratio." Therefore, while differential ICF-MR and HCBS utilization and average costs may cause a poor state such as Alabama to subsidize combined ICF-MR and HCBS expenditures in relatively wealthy states (e.g., Massachusetts and New York), the highly favorable Medicaid federal-state cost share for the poorer states has been effective in establishing a general tendency for them to receive more federal funds for long-term care for persons with MR/DD than they contribute to them

Indexed Utilization Rates

Table 3.10 presents the number of ICF-MR residents and HCBS recipients in each state per 100,000 of that state's population, along with national totals. On June 30, 1996 there were 48.7 ICF-MR residents per 100,000 of the national population. That included 16.7 persons per 100,000 in community ICFs-MR (7.5 in places with 6 or fewer residents and 9.2 in places with 7-15 residents) and 32.0 persons per 100,000 in large ICFs-MR. There was rather remarkable variation in utilization among the states. Louisiana had the highest utilization rate nationally, with 139.2 ICF-MR residents per 100,000 population, followed by District of Columbia with 135.9 residents per 100,000 population. Eight states had more than 150% of the national rate. In contrast, 14 states were less than 50% of the national rate. Figure 3.8 shows this variation on a state-by-state basis.

States with the highest utilization rates for large ICFs-MR included Louisiana (72.5), Mississippi (72.2), Oklahoma (67.9), Wisconsin (64.7), and Illinois (60.6). Twenty states reported large ICF-MR utilization rates below 20 per 100,000. But by far the greatest interstate variability was evident among the community ICFs-MR. Utilization rates for ICFs-MR with 15 or fewer residents were more than 50 per 100,000 in the District of Columbia (135.9), North Dakota (66.8), Indiana (64.6), Louisiana (66.8), and Minnesota (51.6). Eight states had no small ICFs-MR and utilization rates were less than 3.0 in fourteen additional states. There were 34 states with ICFs-MR of 6 or fewer residents, and the states with the highest utilization rates for such small ICFs-MR were the District of Columbia (75.9) and Louisiana (47.8).

Total ICF-MR and HCBS utilization for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities also shows high interstate variability. Nationally on June 30, 1996 there were 120.2 ICF-MR and HCBS recipients per 100,000 of the nation's population. One state had a rate more than triple the national utilization rate. Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Nevada, and Virginia had total Medicaid utilization rates that were less than half the national rate.

Utilization rates for Medicaid community services (both HCBS and community ICFs-MR) also showed great variation around the national average utilization rate of 88.2 per 100,000. Seven states provided Medicaid community services to fewer than 40 persons with MR/DD per 100,000 of the states' total population. Six states had Medicaid community service utilization rates that were more than twice the national average: Arizona (188.4), New York (189.2), North Dakota (344.2), Rhode Island (213.9), South Dakota (187.6), and Vermont (192.8). Figure 3.9 shows this variation on a state-by-state basis.

In noting the extreme variability among states in the utilization of Medicaid ICF-MR and HCBS services, it is important to recognize that some of that variability is a reflection of the size of state residential systems in general. On June 30, 1996 states had an average total utilization rate for all residential services (both Medicaid and non-Medicaid) of 121.4 per 100,000. States varied from 43.0 residential service recipients per 100,000 in Nevada to 295.8 in North Dakota. While states vary markedly in their total utilization of residential placements for persons with MR/DD, state policy decisions create even greater variability in their relative utilization of Medicaid ICF-MR and HCBS programs to finance those services.

Table 3.10 Utilization Rates per 100,000 of State Population: ICF-MR Residents, HCBS Recipients with MR/DD, and all Residential Service Recipients in June 30, 1996 by State

		ICF-MR Residents/100,000 of State Population					Total Recipients			All Residents (ICF-MR & Non-ICF-MR)				
State	State Populations	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	HCBS	HCBS & Community ICFs-MR	HCBS & ICF-MR	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total
AL	43.16	0.0	0.6	0.6	18.5	19.1	79.1	79.7	98.2	19.7	16.5	36.2	19.3	55.5
AK	6.47	3.1	3.1	6.2	2.9	9.1	29.4	35.5	38.5	76.0	11.3	87.3	2.9	90.3
AZ	41.45	0.1	1.9	2.0	2.7	4.7	186.4	188.4	191.1	58.0	2.6	60.6	4.5	65.1
AR	24.90	0.0	12.0	12.0	51.1	63.1	19.0	31.0	82.1	20.6	33.1	53.6	60.1	113.3
CA	328.96	10.4	1.7	12.1	19.0	31.1	88.6	100.7	119.7	96.7	8.9	105.6	27.8	133.4
CO	37.80	0.3	0.0	0.3	6.2	6.5	105.2	105.5	111.7	77.5	15.7	93.2	6.2	99.3
CT	32.73	12.2	7.7	19.9	19.7	39.7	91.6	111.5	131.3	126.9	12.2	139.1	36.9	176.1
DE	7.26	0.0	2.2	2.2	39.1	41.3	48.5	50.7	89.8	58.0	4.3	62.3	40.1	102.3
DC	5.55	75.9	60.0	135.9	0.0	135.9	0.0	135.9	135.9	124.5	67.4	191.9	0.0	191.9
FL	144.31	1.6	0.0	1.6	22.2	23.9	69.3	70.9	93.1	31.5	10.9	42.3	26.9	69.2
GA	72.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.0	28.0	22.5	22.5	50.5	21.3	0.0	21.3	28.0	49.3
HI	12.42	5.7	0.6	6.3	3.9	10.2	41.6	47.9	51.9	86.2	0.6	86.7	5.1	91.8
ID	11.83	3.8	26.4	30.2	15.3	45.5	35.1	65.3	80.6	102.1	44.0	146.2	37.4	183.5
IL	119.16	2.0	24.8	26.8	60.6	87.4	44.2	71.0	131.6	20.3	28.9	49.2	60.6	109.7
IN	58.65	16.5	48.1	64.6	37.4	102.1	13.9	78.5	116.0	43.6	48.1	91.7	38.0	129.7
IA	28.75	4.7	16.0	20.7	55.2	75.9	89.6	110.2	165.5	98.5	69.4	167.8	112.1	279.9
KS	26.25	2.7	8.3	11.0	49.4	60.4	119.8	130.9	180.3	20.8	31.7	52.5	53.6	106.0
KY	38.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.8	29.8	23.8	23.8	53.6	25.8	6.0	31.9	30.2	62.1
LA	43.83	47.8	18.9	66.8	72.5	139.2	47.9	114.7	187.1	72.5	27.1	99.5	83.2	182.8
ME	12.37	9.2	16.4	25.6	10.3	36.0	80.8	106.5	116.8	88.0	25.1	113.0	12.0	125.1
MD	51.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.7	12.7	64.5	64.5	77.2	75.1	6.9	81.9	14.2	96.1
MA	59.71	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.1	30.1	134.4	134.4	164.5	102.0	22.8	124.9	30.5	155.4
MI	96.12	29.5	0.0	29.5	3.6	33.1	54.2	83.7	87.3	120.2	0.0	120.2	3.6	123.8
MN	46.60	18.9	32.7	51.6	30.5	82.1	116.4	168.0	198.5	169.4	35.9	205.4	30.5	235.8
MS	26.83	0.0	7.0	7.0	72.2	79.2	2.4	9.5	81.7	17.4	10.9	28.3	76.4	104.7
MO	53.16	0.2	1.3	1.6	29.3	30.9	106.9	108.5	137.8	56.1	24.7	80.9	41.7	122.6
MT	8.74	0.0	0.9	0.9	18.0	18.9	92.3	93.2	111.2	96.0	57.3	153.3	18.0	171.3
NE	16.56	0.0	0.5	0.5	38.7	39.3	110.7	111.3	150.0	87.7	14.5	102.2	38.7	140.9
NV	15.20	4.1	1.3	5.4	9.9	15.3	23.8	29.1	39.0	31.3	1.3	32.6	10.4	43.0
NH	11.39	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.9	167.3	167.3	169.3	132.1	5.1	137.2	1.9	139.2
NJ	79.72	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.3	51.3	65.8	65.8	117.1	56.5	6.7	63.2	61.9	125.1
NM	17.05	2.9	10.6	13.5	15.0	28.4	91.1	104.6	119.5	94.0	10.6	104.6	15.0	119.5
NY	181.90	3.2	36.0	39.2	25.9	65.1	149.9	189.2	215.1	65.7	96.5	162.2	26.4	188.7
NC	72.43	19.5	6.5	26.0	37.4	63.4	42.8	68.8	106.2	50.3	10.4	60.7	38.5	99.2
ND	6.38	25.1	41.7	66.8	31.0	97.8	277.4	344.2	375.2	175.9	78.8	254.7	41.1	295.8
OH	112.53	1.7	17.6	19.3	49.6	68.9	23.0	42.3	92.0	58.8	27.5	86.4	51.3	137.7
OK	32.93	0.4	0.8	1.2	67.9	69.1	68.6	69.8	137.7	46.2	8.0	54.2	67.9	122.2
OR	31.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.4	13.4	79.0	79.0	92.4	85.1	17.6	102.7	19.4	122.1
PA	121.66	5.7	5.4	11.1	42.0	53.2	49.9	61.1	103.1	80.8	6.0	86.8	45.6	132.4
RI	10.00	19.3	3.2	22.5	0.0	22.5	191.4	213.9	213.9	97.8	33.7	131.5	0.0	131.5
SC	37.72	1.7	27.8	29.5	43.1	72.6	55.0	84.5	127.6	43.7	28.8	72.6	43.1	115.7
SD	7.42	0.0	13.1	13.1	34.0	47.0	174.5	187.6	221.6	133.3	92.2	225.5	34.0	259.4
TN	52.90	2.3	7.1	9.4	29.0	38.3	57.1	66.5	95.4	23.0	27.6	50.6	29.0	79.6
TX	188.81	22.6	4.8	27.4	42.7	70.0	19.4	46.7	89.4	22.6	4.8	27.4	42.7	70.0
UT	19.85	0.0	0.6	0.6	43.0	43.6	107.2	107.8	150.8	62.5	13.9	76.4	43.0	119.4
VT	5.82	2.6	0.0	2.6	0.0	2.6	190.2	192.8	192.8	146.4	0.0	146.4	0.0	146.4
VA	67.26	0.1	2.3	2.5	32.5	35.0	21.6	24.1	56.6	7.0	10.6	17.6	32.5	50.1
WA	56.12	0.7	0.4	1.2	20.0	21.2	83.1	84.3	104.3	79.2	7.1	86.3	26.8	113.1
WV	18.27	3.5	21.3	24.8	7.3	32.2	73.2	98.0	105.4	61.4	36.5	97.9	9.5	107.4
WI	52.03	0.0	0.3	0.3	64.7	65.0	97.3	97.6	162.3	151.3	16.0	167.2	64.7	232.0
WY	4.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.4	29.4	174.9	174.9	204.3	121.3	15.2	136.4	29.4	165.8
U.S. Total	2,659.99	7.5	9.2	16.7	32.0	48.7	71.5	88.2	120.2	64.9	21.2	86.1	35.8	122.0

Figure 3.10 shows patterns of overall U.S. residential services and ICF-MR services utilization from 1962 to 1996. It shows the generally stable, but slightly decreasing ICF-MR utilization rates since 1982. It also shows the steadily increasing overall residential services utilization rate since 1987, when residential services utilization reached 105.1 service recipients per 100,00 of the general U.S. population. It is notable that while the residential utilization rate was increasing by 16.3 residents per 100,000 in the U.S. population in the nine years between 1987 and 1996, the ICF-MR utilization rate decreased by 13.5 residents per 100,000 in the general population. The aging of the "baby boom" generation into adulthood has been a primary driving force of increasing overall placement rates and is contributing to the growing number of people waiting for services.

As shown below, the HCBS program played a major role in funding the residential services of persons not living in ICFs-MR, with an estimated 70.9% of HCBS recipients receiving residential services outside of a home shared with relatives (see Table 3.11). Applying that statistic to all 190,230 HCBS recipients on June 30, 1996 would yield an estimated 134,873 persons receiving residential services outside their family home financed by Medicaid Home and Community Based Services. This means the overall utilization of HCBS to fund community residential services (other than room and board) is now more than triple that of the ICF-MR program.

Figure 3.8 Total ICF-MR Residents per 100,000 of State Population by State on June 30, 1996



National Average =48.7

Figure 3.9 Total Community ICF-MR and HCBS Recipients per 100,000 of State Population by State on June 30, 1996



National Average = 88.2

Figure 3.10
ICF-MR and Non ICF-MR Residential Service Recipients per 100,000 of the U.S. Population, 1962 to 1996



141

142

Residential Arrangements of HCBS Recipients

As part of the 1996 data collection, states were asked to report the most recent available statistics on where their Medicaid Home and Community Based Service recipients lived. The same five categories of residential arrangements were provided as described in Chapter 6. In all, 35 states were able to provide these breakdowns for most HCBS service recipients. These reports are summarized in Table 3.11 by state and residential arrangement. As indicated in the U.S. total, nearly one-half of HCBS recipients (40.8%) received services in a residence owned, rented, or managed by an agency, in which agency staff provide care, instruction, supervision, and support to residents with MR/DD. The estimated national total number of HCBS recipients living in such arrangements was 77,614. The second most frequently utilized residential arrangement of HCBS recipients was living in a home that was also the home of other family member(s). An estimated 55,357 HCBS recipients (29.1% of the total) lived with other family members. The third most frequent residential arrangement was a "family foster home" (i.e., a home owned or rented by a family or individual in which they live and provide care to an unrelated person(s) with MR/DD. It is estimated that nationally 25,681 HCBS recipients (13.5% of the total) lived in such arrangements. Finally, an estimated total of 24,730 HCBS recipients lived in their own homes (i.e., a home owned by or rented to them to which persons come to provide personal assistance, supervision, and/or other support). A small proportion of HCBS recipients (3.6%) were reported to be served in "other" residential arrangements that the reporting states were unable to fit into the categories provided.

Between 1994 and 1996 there was a notable increase in the proportion of HCBS recipients reported to be living in their family home or in their own homes. The estimated proportion of HCBS recipients living with parents or other relatives increased from 23.8% to 29.1% over the 2 years. The proportion of HCBS recipients living in homes that they themselves rented or owned increased from 11.1% to 13.0%.

Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in Generic Medicaid Nursing Facilities

Table 3.12 presents the number of people with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities reported by states to be in Medicaid nursing facilities, other than ones specifically licensed for persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities. The ability of states to report an actual or estimated count of Medicaid nursing facility residents was established primarily in response to the requirement under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (OBRA-87) that states screen nursing home residents with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities for the appropriateness of their placement. States were required to submit an "Alternative Disposition Plan" to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regarding the findings of those screenings.

On June 30, 1996, states identified 37,591 persons with MR/DD in Medicaid nursing homes. This statistic compares with a report of 38,564 on June 30, 1992. Nationwide, the total reported number of persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities in Medicaid nursing homes was 10.5% of the total number (357,270) receiving ICF-MR, Medicaid HCBS and Medicaid (generic) nursing home services, and the reported number of nursing home residents with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities equaled 10.4% of the nation's total population of persons in all types of MR/DD residential settings and in nursing homes (362,158). In 1996, Georgia, Indiana and Tennessee reported persons with mental retardation and related developmental disabilities in nursing homes as more than one-fifth of the total of their MR/DD program residents and nursing home residents.

Table 3.11 HCBS Recipients with MR/DD by Reported Type of Residential Setting on June 30, 1996

State	Residential Facility a	Family Foster Home b	Person's Own Home c	Family Home d	Other Residence	Reported Total	Actual Total
AL	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	3,415
AK	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	190
AZ	2,106	212	36	6,519	NA	8,873	7,727
AR	DNF	0	DNF	DNF	NA	DNF	472
CA	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	29,133
CO	912	0	248 e	349 e	1,732	3,241	3,976
CT	1,707	294	DNF	66	0	2,067	2,999
DE	241	101	10	1	NA	353	352
DC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL	3,608	DNF	1,096	4,755	NA	9,459	10,000
GA	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	1,619
HI	89	291	0	67	1	448	517
ID	0	315	54	46	0	415	415
IL	1,924	0	93	0	NA	2,017	5,267
IN	70	42	127	662	NA	901	816
IA	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	2,575
KS	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	3,146
KY	428 e	259 e	18 e	219 e	NA	924	924
LA	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	2,100
ME	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	1,000
MD	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	3,306
MA	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	8,027
MI	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	5,207
MN	3,789	559	327	989	NA	5,664	5,422
MS	0	0	0	65	0	65	65
MO	2,162	0	1,857	1,651	0	5,670	5,685
MT	548	15 e	75	133 e	0	771	807
NE	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	1,834
NV	80	5	54	0	0	139	361
NH	557	709	124	447	NA	1,837	1,906
NJ	2,452	1,059	112	1,499	NA	5,122	5,242
NM	78	25	164	500 e	1,286	2,053	1,553
NY	DNF	3,990	DNF	DNF	NA	3,990	27,272
NC	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	3,098
ND	336 e	42 e	725 e	198 e	NA	1,301	1,770
OH	615	22	1,012	808	39	2,496	2,593
OK	252 f	232 f	782 f	701 f	NA	1,967	2,260
OR	2,119 e	0	350 e	0	NA	2,469	2,523
PA	4,071	1,074	178	482	NA	5,805	6,076
RI	560	69	66	330 e	NA	1,025	1,914
SC	630	123	412	869	NA	2,034	2,074
SD	826	19	282	62	17	1,206	1,295
TN	781	59	262	343	DNF	1,445	3,021
TX	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	DNF	3,658
UT	950 e	80 e	303 e	633 e	0	1,966	2,128
VT	131	553	46 e	226	NA	956	1,107
VA	943	31	42	437	NA	1,453	1,453
WA	625	211	2,033	1,665	132	4,666	4,666
WV	292	134	55	628	0	1,109	1,337
WI	2,315	1,597	750	461	NA	5,123	5,063
WY	502	32	25	305	NA	864	864
Reported Total	36,699	12,154	11,718	26,116	3,207	89,894	
% by Category	40.8%	13.5%	13.0%	29.1%	3.6%	100.0%	
Est. U.S. Total	77,614	25,681	24,730	55,357	6,848		
Actual U.S. Total							190,230

a A place of residence owned, rented or managed by an agency, in which staff provide care, instruction, supervision and support to residents with MR/DD

b A home owned or rented by families or individuals in which they live and provide care to unrelated persons with MR/DD.

c A home owned or rented by person(s) with MR/DD into which persons come to provide personal assistance, instruction, monitoring and/or other support.

d The home of persons with MR/DD which is also the primary residence of parents or other relatives.

e indicates estimate f indicates 1995 data DNF indicates data not furnished

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3.12 Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Developmental Disabilities in Nursing Facilities on June 30, 1996 by State

State	Persons with MR/DD in Non-Specialized Nursing Homes	Total MR/DD Recipients of ICF-MR and HCBS	Persons with MR/DD in Nursing Homes, ICFs-MR, or Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD in Nursing Homes, as % of Persons with MR/DD in Nursing Homes, ICFs-MR, or Receiving HCBS	Total Residents in MR/DD Residential Settings	Residents in MR/DD Residential Settings and Nursing Homes	Persons with MR/DD in Nursing Homes, as % of All Residents in MR/DD Residences and Nursing Homes
AL	162	4,240	4,402	3.7%	2,395	2,557	6.3%
AK	28	249	277	10.1%	584	612	4.6%
AZ	67	7,920	7,987	0.8%	2,697	2,764	2.4%
AR	0	2,044	2,044	0.0%	2,822	2,822	0.0%
CA	1,248 a	39,366	40,614	3.1%	43,878	45,126	2.8%
CO	258 e	4,221	4,479	5.8%	3,755	4,013	6.4%
CT	394	4,297	4,691	8.4%	5,763	6,157	6.4%
DE	0	652	652	0.0%	743	743	0.0%
DC	28	754	782	3.6%	1,065	1,093	2.6%
FL	0	13,442	13,442	0.0%	9,988	9,988	0.0%
GA	2,200 e,b	3,638	5,838	37.7%	3,557	5,757	38.2%
HI	87	644	731	11.9%	1,140	1,227	7.1%
ID	39 e	953	992	3.9%	2,171	2,210	1.8%
IL	2,872 e	15,683	18,555	15.5%	13,077	15,949	18.0%
IN	2,057 a	6,802	8,859	23.2%	7,604	9,661	21.3%
IA	148	4,757	4,905	3.0%	8,048	8,196	1.8%
KS	0	4,732	4,732	0.0%	2,783	2,783	0.0%
KY	0	2,081	2,081	0.0%	2,409	2,409	0.0%
LA	1,267	8,202	9,469	13.4%	8,011	9,278	13.7%
ME	45 a	1,445	1,490	3.0%	1,547	1,592	2.8%
MD	336	3,958	4,294	7.8%	4,927	5,263	6.4%
MA	1,828	9,822	11,650	15.7%	9,281	11,109	16.5%
MI	748 a	8,392	9,140	8.2%	11,903	12,651	5.9%
MN	1,144	9,248	10,392	11.0%	10,990	12,134	9.4%
MS	0	2,191	2,191	0.0%	2,808	2,808	0.0%
MO	1,125	7,328	8,453	13.3%	6,518	7,643	14.7%
MT	169	972	1,141	14.8%	1,497	1,666	10.1%
NE	0	2,484	2,484	0.0%	2,334	2,334	0.0%
NV	32	593	625	5.1%	653	685	4.7%
NH	101	1,928	2,029	5.0%	1,585	1,686	6.0%
NJ	371	9,333	9,704	3.8%	9,969	10,340	3.6%
NM	138	2,038	2,176	6.3%	2,038	2,176	6.3%
NY	8,454	39,118	47,572	17.8%	34,316	42,770	19.8%
NC	850	7,691	8,541	10.0%	7,183	8,033	10.6%
ND	175 e	2,394	2,569	6.8%	1,887	2,062	8.5%
OH	2,169	10,349	12,518	17.3%	15,491	17,660	12.3%
OK	930 a	4,535 a	5,465 a	17.0% a	4,023 a	4,953 a	18.8%
OR	265 a	2,952	3,217	8.2%	3,900	4,165	6.4%
PA	1,544 e,c	12,545	14,089	11.0%	16,104	17,648	8.7%
RI	0	2,139	2,139	0.0%	1,315	1,315	0.0%
SC	0	4,814	4,814	0.0%	4,363	4,363	0.0%
SD	169	1,644	1,813	9.3%	1,925	2,094	8.1%
TN	1,351 e	5,049	6,400	21.1%	4,209	5,560	24.3%
TX	3,258 d	16,882	20,140	16.2%	13,224	16,482	19.8%
UT	241	2,994	3,235	7.4%	2,371	2,612	9.2%
VT	66	1,122	1,188	5.6%	852	918	7.2%
VA	0	3,810	3,810	0.0%	3,373	3,373	0.0%
WA	492	5,853	6,345	7.8%	6,346	6,838	7.2%
WV	30	1,925	1,955	1.5%	1,962	1,992	1.5%
WI	672	8,445	9,117	7.4%	12,069	12,741	5.3%
WY	33	1,009	1,042	3.2%	819	852	3.9%
U.S. Total	37,591	319,679	357,270	10.5%	324,567	362,158	10.4%

a indicates 1995 data
b indicates 1994 data
c indicates 1993 data
d indicates 1991 data
e indicates estimate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ICF-MR and HCBS for Persons with MR/DD as a Proportion of All Federal Medicaid Expenditures

Between 1992 and 1996 most of the growth in federal Medicaid expenditures for ICF-MR and HCBS for persons with MR/DD was due to growth in expenditures for HCBS. In Fiscal Year 1992, states received $888,900,000 in federal reimbursements for Medicaid HCBS services for persons with MR/DD (Braddock, et. al., 1995). By Fiscal Year 1994 federal reimbursements for Medicaid HCBS services had nearly doubled to $1,665,390,500, and by Fiscal Year 1996 federal reimbursements for Medicaid HCBS had increased another 58.8% to $2,644,696,016. Although ICF-MR populations decreased between June 1992 and June 1996 from 146,260 to 129,449 residents, there was an increase in federal ICF-MR expenditures from $5.08 to $5.53 billion. This increase of $.45 billion compared with a $1.76 billion increase in federal HCBS reimbursements over the same period.

Because Medicaid long-term care services are being steadily transformed from ICF-MR to HCBS programs, primarily by moving people out of ICFs-MR, but also by converting community ICFs-MR into HCBS financed community settings, it can be instructive to examine federal allocations to the combined ICF-MR and HCBS programs for persons with MR/DD. Doing so stimulates two observations about federal Medicaid reimbursements for long-term care of persons with MR/DD. First, long-term care payments for persons with MR/DD make up a substantial and disproportionately large amount of total federal Medicaid expenditures (i.e., per recipient costs for persons with MR/DD receiving long-term care are much greater than the per recipient Medicaid costs for the general Medicaid population). Second, the proportion of total federal Medicaid expenditures going to the ICF-MR and HCBS programs for persons with MR/DD has actually decreased over the past several years.

As shown in Table 3.13, federal expenditures for Medicaid ICF-MR and HCBS programs for persons with MR/DD increased by 124% between 1988 and 1996 (increased by $4.52 billion dollars from $3.65 billion dollars). These increases contributed significantly to the overall growth in total federal Medicaid expenditures. Still the growth rate of federal ICF-MR and HCBS expenditures for persons with MR/DD between 1988 and 1996 was 10.6%, substantially less than the overall Medicaid growth rate of 14.25% per year. In fact, between 1988 and 1996 the combined federal reimbursements for the ICF-MR and HCBS programs for persons with MR/DD decreased from 12.0% to 9.2% of all federal Medicaid expenditures. Federal payments from ICF-MR and HCBS for persons with MR/DD as a proportion of all Medicaid expenditures did increase, however, between 1995 and 1996 from 8.7% to 9.2%. This change was primarily attributable to the remarkably small growth in total Medicaid expenditures (3%). Between 1995 and 1996 federal payments for ICF-MR and HCBS programs for persons with MR/DD also grew more slowly (8.9%) than the 1988 to 1996 average (10.6%).

Table 3.13
Federal Medicaid Expenditures for ICF-MR and HCBS Programs for Persons with MR/DD as a Proportion of All Federal Medicaid Expenditures

Year	Total Federal Medicaid Expenditures	Total Federal ICF-MR and HCBS Expenditures for Persons with MR/DD	Federal ICF-MR and HCBS Expenditures for Persons with MR/DD as Proportion of All Medicaid Expenditures
1980	$14.550 billion	$1.7383 billion	11.9%
1988	$30.462 billion	$3.6484 billion	12.0%
1992	$64.003 billion	$5.7785 billion	9.0%
1993	$73.504 billion	$6.5085 billion	8.9%
1994	$78.261 billion	$6.9430 billion	8.9%
1995	$86.684 billion	$7.5057 billion	8.7%
1996	$88.918 billion	$8.1711 billion	9.2%

Source: HCFA, Office of State Financial Management

Despite their decreasing proportion of all federal Medicaid expenditures, it is hard to overlook the disproportionately high expenditures for ICF-MR and HCBS recipients with MR/DD in comparison with the average for all Medicaid recipients. In 1996 the average federal contribution for each Medicaid beneficiary was $2,400. This is compared to an average federal expenditure of $26,500 for each ICF-MR and HCBS recipient with developmental disabilities. There are fairly clear factors contributing to these differences (the costs of extensive personal care and residential supports, inclusion of daytime habilitation programs, case management and so forth). Nevertheless the substantial difference between these levels of expenditures for long-term care recipients with MR/DD and the "average" Medicaid participant should remain a concern to those with an interest in assuring that Medicaid reform proposals do not contain strong implicit or explicit restrictions on resources available to and needed by persons with MR/DD. For example, proposals to allow controlled growth in federal Medicaid expenditures by granting states a payment for each new enrollee that is based on the average federal Medicaid payment could appear to states to provide on average only about 10% of the current federal contribution for persons with MR/DD in ICF-MR and HCBS programs and barely 5% of what those services actually cost. The extent to which such "averaging" would have a negative effect on resources allocated to individuals who need levels and types of service that cost far above the Medicaid average is unknown, but worthy of concern.

CHAPTER 10
CONVERSION OF MEDICAID INTERMEDIATE CARE FACILITIES FOR PERSONS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION/DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES TO HOME AND COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES

Lynda Anderson
Jennifer Sandlin
Robert Prouty
K. Charlie Lakin

The 1971 creation of the Medicaid Intermediate Care Facility for the Mentally Retarded (ICF-MR) program established federal regulations and federal cost-sharing for residential services provided in settings complying with specific federal standards. Although originally a means of improving institutional care, federal cost share enticed most states to certify community group homes as ICFs-MR as well. The 1981 enactment of Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) provided states with a less regulated alternative to obtaining Medicaid cost-share to finance community services. Since 1995 HCBS has been the nation's largest Medicaid long-term care program for people with developmental disabilities. Generally these changes have been consistent with and have contributed to a national movement toward smaller and less heavily regulated residential settings. As shown in the previous chapter HCBS has also tended to be substantially less costly than ICF-MR.

In recent years, cost-containment and quality of life concerns have prompted states to reevaluate their development of community ICFs-MR, and in many states the conversion of some community group homes from ICF-MR to HCBS funding. In a number of states consideration has been/is being given to changing state restrictions on maximum size of HCBS sites (there are no federal restrictions) to allow an increased number of conversions of community ICFs-MR to HCBS sites. As related to these trends, this chapter summarizes policies and actions of states as of fall 1996 regarding numbers of HCBS recipients allowed per residential site, the number of actual and planned conversions of ICFs-MR to HCBS, and related information.

HCBS Recipients per Home

A significant factor in the possibility and desirability of converting community ICFs-MR to HCBS sites is limits established by the state on the number of people who can live together in home. If state rules set a limit of 4 persons per setting funded by HCBS obviously an ICF-MR of 6 residents cannot be converted without a rule change. Many who advocate for smaller residential settings are/would be concerned about HCBS services to be delivered in residential settings larger than currently allowed.

Table 10.1 shows by state the maximum number of HCBS recipients allowed per single living unit, procedures for assuring such limits, and procedures for licensing residences and services. The number of each state's total HCBS recipients on June 30, 1996 and the combined federal and state expenditures per HCBS recipient in Fiscal Year 1996. As shown 40 states reported specific limits on household size, ranging from 2 persons to 20 persons. Twenty-eight states, with about two-fifths (38.4%) of all HCBS recipients, limit household size for HCBS recipients to 8 or fewer persons. Nineteen states reported limits of 6 or fewer persons. Nine states reported no legal limit on the number of HCBS recipients allowed per residence. (The District of Columbia was not yet providing HCBS services at the time of the survey and another state was unable to respond because of a related court action).

It is important to note that, irrespective of formal limits on the size of residence of HCBS recipients, the vast majority of homes for HCBS recipients are effectively limited to 6 or fewer persons. Larger HCBS financed residential settings, where reported, typically have been pre-existing facilities "grandfathered" into HCBS financing. State respondents are clearly aware of the association of smaller homes with community inclusion, social participation and the development of independence and desire that their HCBS programs reflect those benefits.

In addition to the range of allowable sizes of HCBS residential settings, there is also variety in the mechanisms that are employed in states to establish and enforce size limits (e.g., legal limits; funding restrictions; state agency persuasion). Some states use multiple approaches, but state laws, rules or regulations are by far the most common approach to limiting the size of the homes of HCBS recipients. Because most states provide HCBS in a number of different type of homes, a number of different licensing

Table 3.14: HCBS Resident Limit and Authority, Licensing/Certification

State	Maximum Number of People		How Size Limit is Established	How Residences are Licensed	1996 Total HCBS Recipients	1996 Total State and Federal Expenditures
AL	12		contracts with providers	group training homes, supervised community living	2,949c	$38,000,000
AK	no maximum		state statute, regulation and funding	all are licensed as assisted living	190	$7,071,179
AZ	6		state law	foster homes or group homes	7,727	$189,920,600
AR	no maximum		NA	group homes, supervised living arrangements or community agencies are licensed	472	$13,238,063
CA	no maximum		per facility license	adult family homes, group homes licensed by state; supportive living settings are unlicensed	19,101c	$254,505,000c
CO	8		state law	group homes	3,976	$125,499,063
CT	15	d	regulations and guidelines	community living arrangements, community training homes	2,903	$152,291,188
DE	5		state regulation	foster homes, group homes or supervised living settings	352	$2,291,107
DC	NA		Not applicable: initial HCBS approval effective 10/1/96	NA	NA	NA
FL	NA		No response - currently in related litigation	NA	NA	NA
GA	4		departmental standards	personal care homes	848c	$17,300,000c
HI	5		state law/departmental regulations	foster homes, care homes, DD domiciliary homes	517	$11,981,568
ID	2		state law and departmental rules	foster care	381	$8,093,140
IL	20	b	state law, rule and regulation	foster care, group homes, community living facilities	5,267	$58,434,675
IN	no maximum	b	state law on life safety rules	provider certified to provide HCBS	816	$23,461,273
IA	4		state law, funding eligibility	7 different HCBS services, "Individualized Comprehensive Plan"	1,669	$16,702,038
KS	8		state law/contracts with providers	license HCBS providers	3,146	$71,568,974
KY	3		state regulation	family homes or group homes	924	$27,820,162c
LA	4		state law	licensed as an HCBS residence	2,100	$42,364,945
ME	6		state rules	licensed as HCBS boarding homes and HCBS foster homes	742c	$15,290,875c

State	Maximum Number of People		How Size Limit is Established	How Residences are Licensed	1996 Total HCBS Recipients	1996 Total State and Federal Expenditures
MD	8		state law	group homes, alternative living units, individual family placements, supported living programs	3,306	$130,701,576
MA	4		state regulation	agencies are certified, using outcomes of persons served as quality indicators	8,027	$248,400,000
MI	20	a	state law	foster care	5,207	$163,000,000
MN	4		state law/departmental rules and regulations	foster care or supervised living settings	5,422	$209,862,745
MS	10		state rule/regulation	licensed according to departmental standards	0	$0
MO	no maximum	b	NA	group homes, apartment, or individualized supported living	5,685	$137,227,661
MT	8		state rule	foster homes or group homes	807	$20,399,850
NE	no maximum; in practice 9 is largest		departmental policy	group homes, supervised apartments, foster care extended family services	1,834	$45,063,000
NV	supervised living-4, group homes-6		state rule/regulation	provider of HCBS licensed as group care facilities; supportive living settings have contracts with DMH/MR	340	$3,180,142c
NH	3	a	state rules	community residences	1,906	$80,460,077
NJ	16		state law	group homes, supervised apartments, community care residences, supportive living	5,242	$154,968,000
NM	15 for group homes, 3 for supported living		state regulation/departmental policy	group homes	1,243	$43,590,526
NY	14		state regulation	family care homes, supervised community residences, supportive community residences, Individualized Residential Alternatives	27,272	$728,613,813
NC	6		departmental policy	supervised living, group homes	3,098	$56,651,027
ND	no maximum		NA	licensed by State DD unit/accredited by Accreditation Council	1,770	$28,924,495
OH	8	a	state law/regulation	facilities licensed by OMRDD	2,593	$97,365,161
OK	12		departmental policy/contracts with providers	group homes are licensed by DD division, smaller settings approved but not licensed	1,955c	$73,677,252c

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State	Maximum Number of People		How Size Limit is Established	How Residences are Licensed	1996 Total HCBS Recipients	1996 Total State and Federal Expenditures
OR	5	a	departmental policy	residence-based are licensed as group homes, other support services are certified by state	2,500c	$86,714,237c
PA	4	a	departmental policy	community homes and family living homes	6,076	$340,698,937
RI	no maximum, in practice 15 is largest		NA	group homes	1,914	$80,600,000
SC	12		policy of governing board	boarding homes, group homes, foster care, supervised living settings	2,074	$32,600,000
SD	8		state rule	foster care, supervised apartments, licensed residential facilities	1,295	$33,903,140
TN	8		state law	group homes, habilitation facilities, foster care, supervised living services	3,021	$71,431,397
TX	3		standards for provider participation	provider is licensed	3,658	$82,982,512
UT	8, but usually 4		state law	group homes, foster care, professional parent, supported living	2,128	$40,827,000
VT	6		state rule, funding, departmental policy	residences with 3+ people licensed by state	1,107	$45,137,783
VA	no maximum	b	NA	group homes, foster care residences, supported living settings, supervised apartments	1,453	$50,479,113
WA	20		departmental policy	DD division, facility-based services also licensed annually by other agency	4,666	$97,771,853
WV	8		best practices	foster care, group residences	1,337	$36,075,324
WI	4	a	state rule/regulation	group homes, foster care and treatment foster care homes, adult family homes	5,063	$103,000,000
WY	no maximum		informally encourage no more than 4 people in new shared residences	DNF	864	$29,157,556
Total					161,489e	

a indicates state has facilities larger than the current maximum which were "grandfathered in"
b indicates the majority of settings have 8 or fewer residents
c indicates FY 1995 data
d indicates only 2 or 3 such facilities were "grandfathered"; in practice, majority have 6 or fewer residents

standards and procedures are applied to those homes. Five states reported that beyond certifying providers of HCBS services, there are no specific standards for the homes in which HCBS recipients live. In those states which license individual HCBS residential sites, residences are licensed as foster care settings, community living arrangements, supported living arrangements, group homes or other services which denote group living, foster care or individual supports.

Selection of HCBS Recipients

Table 10.2 presents a summary of information provided by state respondents on procedures for determining who is enrolled in their HCBS programs, the effects of resources and service needs on the decision, and alternatives considered in selecting who will receive HCBS from among the eligible persons. In keeping with the community focus of HCBS, half of the reporting states indicated that decisions to provide HCBS to eligible individuals are made at the local level, in a decision-making process involving the individual and an interdisciplinary team of professionals and family members supporting the individual. Other states report a "first come, first served" policy, or selection of individual recipients by state staff. A growing number of states are expressing commitments to provide HCBS services to any eligible individual, regardless of that person's level of need. Seventeen states reported that level of need and anticipated service costs were not inhibiting factors in selecting eligible individuals to receive HCBS, as long as the person could be appropriately served. But spending caps, aggregated averages, and waiting lists were used to control the costs in some of these states and they did influence decisions about serving particularly needy/costly individuals. In effect, in almost all states costs were either a formal or informal factor in determining HCBS access.

Whether for cost, designation of the HCBS program as being for a certain population, or other factors determining that HCBS services are not appropriate for an individual, most states designate alternative community settings as alternatives when HCBS is not an option. The most frequently noted community option was a community ICF-MR. In several states the state institutions were viewed as the primary alternative when HCBS was viewed as inappropriate or non-achievable.

Table 3.15: Selection of Persons with MR/DD to Receive HCBS

State	Decision Maker	Consideration of Resource Constraints	Alternative Settings
AL	IDT based on individual choice, resources, and appropriateness of care	resources are considered in decision	NA
AK	regions serve from waiting list based on available funds	eligible individuals are selected from waiting list until no funds are available	would be served using Alaska's general fund dollars
AZ	1115 demonstration waiver, all eligible enrolled	all eligible enrolled	state managed care approach that makes all "options" from the same funding
AR	first come, first served	plan of care caps for different program levels	state institution, other non- HCBS setting
CA	individual's planning team	all eligible, but must be "cost effective"	NA
CO	first come, first served/case management agency	opening matched with identified needs, new resources usually go to high needs	NA
CT	individual's IDT and QMRP	state matching funds must have been appropriated	community ICF-MR larger than HCBS settings

State	Decision Maker	Consideration of Resource Constraints	Alternative Settings
DE	division of MR based on person's support needs	limited in aggregate by division's budget	state institution
GA	MHMRSA regional boards	regional board must identify the state match for placement	state institution
HI	DD division determines eligibility for DD services/Medicaid agency determines admission to HCBS	no applicant denied based on availability of funds/priority to persons placed in or at risk of placement in institutions.	another non-HCBS setting
ID	regional DD authority and central office	NA	community ICF-MR larger than HCBS settings/state institution
IL	DMHDD approves resident placement and supports/person must be eligible to receive waiver	priority given to consent decree class members, people living in state operated facilities, and community crisis cases	community ICF-MR larger than an HCBS setting
IN	area agencies for diversions, state case managers for conversions, first come, first served	DNF	community ICF-MR, state institution, another setting (SNF, group home)
IA	county makes decision based on case manager recommendations	counties determine slots for adults/state for children and state cases	county care facility, ICF-MR larger than HCBS settings, state institution
KS	community developmental disability organization	effectively no constraints	NA
KY	waiting list/first come, first served	state cap for waiver services	state institution
LA	state regional officers	first come, first served with a few emergency exceptions.	no one is refused because of resource constraints
ME	case manager, registered nurse, Medicaid rules, available funding	available funding is considered	another setting
MD	services coordinator/case manager	state match must already be appropriated	cost has not prevented an HCBS placement to date
MA	recommendation of service coordinator and ISP team/HCBS eligibility	prioritized waiting lists	no individual cost limit has been defined
MI	local responsible mental health agency	persons with most severe conditions served first	no individual cost limit has been defined
MN	county social service agency	aggregate average allowed each county	community ICF-MR larger than HCBS setting
MS	regional retardation facilities	person and financial caps as approved in waiver	community ICF-MR larger then HCBS/ home

State	Decision Maker	Consideration of Resource Constraints	Alternative Settings
MO	state agency determines eligibility/individual chooses to accept HCBS	NA	have not found any person too expensive to serve in waiver
MT	team composed of state and provider staff	assessment information used to determine if provider can meet person's needs	another setting
NE	state Medicaid agency/dept. of social services	individual Medicaid eligibility	state general-funded community based setting
NV	caseworker in conjunction with IDT, director of community services	review of persons needing supports, state priority and waiting list, comparison of alternative settings	community ICF-MR, state institution
NH	state decides on proposals from local agencies	sufficient funds, HCFA cap, overall average	on waiting list
NJ	eligibility for DD services and receives waiver eligible services	availability of funds	NA
NM	DD division determines eligibility for DD services and budget availability, HSD/ISD determines financial eligibility, BC/BS determines medical eligibility	federal and state appropriations determines number of individuals to be served based on aggregate costs	community ICF-MR, another setting
NY	regional office directors	OMRDD's annual priorities for HCBS enrollment and funding	cost does not preclude receipt of HCBS services
NC	local DD programs (eligibility determined by state DD and DMA)	priority listing in terms of client needs	state institution, community ICF-MR, another setting
ND	DD case manager	HCBS level of care does not include resource considerations	community ICF-MR of the size of an HCBS setting
OH	first come, first served	state regulations include cost as a component of eligibility	community ICF-MR, state institution, in-home with supports, state-funded home
OK	waiting list/first come, first served	no disqualification from HCBS due to severity of need	NA
OR	state based on eligibility and funding	waiting list, based on whether or not appropriate service can be provided in community	state institution, but somebody from institution must move out
PA	placement was controlled by county MH/MR program	caps on number of people served and maximum per capita expense	community ICF-MR, state institution
RI	state case manager	overall state budget must be met, no individual cost limit	NA
SC	Dept. of Disabilities and Special Needs	HCBS can not exceed the cost of serving an individual in an ICF-MR	community ICF-MR the size of an HCBS setting

State	Decision Maker	Consideration of Resource Constraints	Alternative Settings
SD	Division of Developmental Disabilities	prioritized waiting list	another setting
TN	DMH/MR Department of Mental Health/Mental Retardation	statewide average may not be exceeded: individual averaging allowed	community ICF-MR, state institution
TX	DMHMR Department of Mental Health/Mental Retardation	persons enrolled first come, first served off waiting list	another setting
UT	waiver case manager	considered in scope of services, must stay within aggregated average	more likely to use community ICF-MR, state institution
VT	state DD division	provided to eligible people in accordance with funding policy that prioritizes funding based on need	HCBS setting would not be too costly
VA	local community service board and case manager	financial constraints may limit access, localities prioritize need	community ICF-MR, state institution, waiting list with other state/local services
WA	individual case manager	amount of funding determines capacity	another setting or unserved
WV	selection committee from MR/DD Waiver Service Coordinator Agencies, with final eligibility determined by state certification agency	prioritization guidelines examine natural supports, entitlement programs, current resources, and unmet needs due to unavailability or inaccessibility of needed supports through alternative resources	community ICF-MR the size of an HCBS setting
WI	county programs	financial resources	depends on available natural supports
WY	adult and child DD manages within limits of waiver	NA	NA

Conversions of ICF-MR to HCBS

Number of conversions. As noted earlier in this report in the last 3 years ICF-MR residents have decreased by 12% and HCBS recipients have increased by 120%, with a combined ICF-MR and HCBS service recipient increase of 36%. Most of net growth in HCBS recipients has resulted from overall increases in Medicaid long-term care recipients (i.e., the total receiving HCBS and ICF-MR services). But about 17.6% (18,280 people) of the change reflects "conversion" of ICF-MR "beds" to HCBS capacity, accomplished by reducing populations of and/or closing ICFs-MR and serving former residents in new homes financed by HCBS programs. But as shown in Table 10.3, 19 states have directly converted ICFs-MR to HCBS financed residences or are planning to do so. Virtually all of actual and planned conversions are in settings with 15 or fewer residents with the majority of these in settings with 6 or fewer residents. Two states account for most of the actual or planned conversions. New York has converted a total of 305 ICFs-MR, with another 50 conversions planned, including 100 4-6 bed facilities, and 255 7-15 bed facilities. Pennsylvania has converted 20 4-6 bed facilities and plans to convert 300 4-6 bed facilities. The extent of actual and planned direct conversions in the other 14 states range from 1 to 128. In total about 1,039 ICF-MR conversions have been accomplished or are planned, 1,030 of which are community ICFs-MR (i.e., places with 15 or fewer residences). As an indicator of the magnitude of the accomplished and planned conversions of community ICFs-MR in June 1995 there were 6,150 community ICFs-MR in operation.

Reasons for Conversions. Table 10.4 summarizes the reasons given, by order of importance, for the

accomplished or planned conversions of ICFs-MR to HCBS in 18 of the 19 states. Nine state respondents indicated that considerations related to "improving residents' quality of life" was the primary reason for conversions. Six states indicated considerations related to cost as the primary factor. Two states cited "increased service flexibility", and one state cited "deregulation" as the motivating factor.

Table 3.16: Number of Residential Settings Directly Converted from ICFs-MR to HCBS

State	ICFs-MR with 1-15 residents, 6/30/95	ICFs-MR with 1-6 residents		ICFs-MR with 7-15 residents		ICFs-MR with 16+ residents		Total ICFs-MR	
		Converted	Planned Conver.	Converted	Planned Conver.	Converted	Planned Conver.	Converted	Planned Conver.
AL	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AK	6	4	NA	2	NA	0	0	6	0
AZ	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AR	30	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	27
CA	767	DNF	0	DNF	0	DNF	0	0	0
CO	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	112	2	4	0	5	0	0	2	9
DE	4	0	0	11	2	0	0	11	2
GA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HI	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ID	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IL	240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IN	546	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IA	82	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
KS	34	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LA	433	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ME	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
MD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	0	0	0	66	0	0	0	66	0
MI	500	128	DNF	0	0	0	0	128	0
MN	304	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MS	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MO	15	6	0	8	0	3	0	17	0
MT	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NV	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NH	6	2	0	4	0	0	0	6	0
NJ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NM	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	751	80	20	225	30	0	0	305	50
NC	264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ND	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OH	233	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OK	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OR	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	8	0
PA*	217	20	300	0	0	0	0	20	300

State	ICFs-MR with 1-15 residents, 6/30/95	ICFs-MR with 1-6 residents		ICFs-MR with 7-15 residents		ICFs-MR with 16+ residents		Total ICFs-MR	
		Converted	Planned Conver.	Converted	Planned Conver.	Converted	Planned Conver.	Converted	Planned Conver.
RI	53	42	0	0	0	0	0	42	0
SC	150	4	1	0	3	0	0	4	4
SD	9	0	0	11	0	0	0	11	0
TN	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TX	828	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VT	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VA	16	6	0	2	1	0	0	8	1
WA	17	6	0	3	0	0	0	9	0
WV	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6150	301	325	335	69	9	0	645	394

DNF indicates "data not furnished" * PA conversions will affect both 1-6 and 7-15 bed ICF-MR.

Table 3.17: Motives for Converting of ICFs-MR to HCBS

	Significance of states' motives for direct conversions (Most significant = 1, least = 4)				
State	Cost Savings	Deregulation	Increase service flexibility	Improve residents' quality of life	Other
AK	2	4	3	1	
AR	3	4	2	1	
CT	4	3	1	2	
DE	0	0	3	1	a
IA	1	3	2	4	
KS	NR	NR	NR	NR	
ME	4	3	2	1	
MA	2	5	4	1	a,b
MI	4	3	2	1	
MO	4	3	2	1	
NH	1	4	3	2	
NY	3	4	2	1	
OR	4	1	2	3	
PA	3	0	1	2	
RI	1	2	4	3	
SC	1	2	3	4	
SD	1	4	3	2	
VA	1	4	3	2	
WA	4	3	2	1	

a) serve more consumers at minimal cost b) bring all DD services under one governmental division. NR= not reported.

Post-Conversion Changes

Table 10.5 summarizes reported changes in facilities and programs following direct conversion of ICFs-MR to HCBS. Seventeen state respondents noted that some change had occurred. Seven states indicated that in the process of conversion at least some former ICFs-MR ended up with fewer people living in them. Four states indicated that changes were made in staffing, generally to improve flexibility in providing services and/or to decrease the number of professionals included on staff or as consultants. Nine states reported changes in licensing/certification and nine states reported change in per diems.

Table 3.18: Post-conversion Changes in Facilities and Programs

	Post-conversion changes				
State	**Size**	**Staff**	**Program**	**License**	**Per diem**
AK	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
AR					maximum per diem for HCBS is same as for community ICFs/MR ($142.47).
CT					
DE	sizes of homes reduced			Yes	per diem reduced
IA	no more than 4 residents			Yes	
KS	6 residents moved to 3 smaller sites			Yes, under community regulations	per diem reduced
ME	none				
MA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MI	none				
MO	most became smaller			Yes accredita-tion as a group home.	
NE	downsizing (not closing) ICFs/MR resulted in movement of ICF/MR funding to local service board.			Yes, new approach to licensing	
NH				Yes	15% cut in budget for ICF-MR to HCBS

	Post-conversion changes				
State	**Size**	**Staff**	**Program**	**License**	**Per diem**
NY		some clinical services now provided in clinics or other community sites vs. in the residence		Yes	
OR	no more than 5 residents			Yes	
PA	none	none	more flexible	Yes, licensed as community residence	none
RI				Yes	
SC				Yes	Yes
SD				Yes	Per diem reduced
WA		reduction in professional service staff, (e.g., therapist)		Yes	per diem reduced

Discussion

Since its inception, in 1981, the Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) program has been seen by many consumers, families, advocates and policy makers as providing an opportunity to enhance the quality of life of persons with developmental disabilities by offering community residential options as alternatives to congregate care facilities. States have undertaken efforts to achieve this goal primarily through creation of new HCBS service sites, but also more recently through direct conversion of ICFs-MR to HCBS financing. In most instances state respondents reported these efforts to be motivated by intentions to improve the residents' quality of life and reduce unnecessary costs. They also noted the importance of increasing service flexibility and escaping the burden and demoralization of regulations that are not perceived to benefit service recipients. There is no federal limit on the number of people who can live in a setting financed by Medicaid "Home and Community Based Services," and in a number of states there is also no state limit on the number of HCBS recipients per residence. Indeed the size of some facilities housing HCBS recipients exceeds the average size of ICFs-MR, and in a majority of states the maximum allowable size is 8 or more people (including states with no formal size limits). However, in practice all states are in the process of developing substantially smaller settings. Leaders in some of those states view conversion of community ICFs-MR to HCBS financing, even when people stay in the same home, as a step toward people having more options by having their funding limited to services rather than facilities.

SECTION IV

STATE PROFILES OF SELECTED SERVICE INDICATORS, 1977-1996

CHAPTER 11
PROFILES OF TRENDS IN STATE RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

Ellen Blake
K. Charlie Lakin
Robert Prouty

Each year the Residential Information System Project (RISP) receives requests from one or more individuals on groups from at least half of all states for trend data on different aspects of their state's residential services system. These requests come from state agencies, advocacy and consumer organizations, service provider groups and others. Responses to these requests utilize statistics that have been collected by projects of the Research and Training Center on Residential Services and Community Living since 1977. In this chapter, some of the statistics that are frequently requested have been used to create a "profile" for each state and for the United States as a whole. The data points are for June 30 of each year shown on the profiles. On occasion states have not been able to provide an updated report for each year of the RISP survey. In such instances statistics from the previous year have been repeated and the year has been marked with an asterisk (*). The statistics included in each state profile include: a) the number of persons with mental retardation and developmental disabilities (MR/DD) living in residential settings of different sizes; b) the number of persons with MR/DD receiving residential services per 100,000 of the state's population; c) total state MR/DD institution populations; d) average daily state MR/DD institution expenditures; e) percentage of state MR/DD institution residents who are children and youth (0-21 years old); f) the number of residents of Intermediate Care Facilities [for people with] Mental Retardation (ICF-MR); g) the number of persons with MR/DD receiving Medicaid Home and Community Based Services (HCBS); and h) the number of persons with MR/DD living in Nursing Facilities.

The statistics presented in the state profiles for 1977 and 1982 come from national surveys of individual residential facilities in those years. The facilities surveyed included all residential settings that were identifiable as being state-licensed or state-operated to serve persons with mental retardation and other developmental disabilities. Data for 1987 to 1996 come from annual surveys of state MR/DD, Medicaid and other relevant program agencies. The former studies' outcomes were shaped by state licencing data bases, while the latter studies relied on state information systems. In most states these two approaches included the same settings. But in a few states residential programs that serve significant numbers of persons with MR/DD are operated as generic programs without involvement of and information to the state agency that has general program responsibility for persons with MR/DD. In these few states the 1977 and 1982 data were inclusive of a wider range of residential settings than were the data for 1987 and later.

ALABAMA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
AL	77	49	61	110	1995	2105	57	1836	$48	17%	0	0	
AL	82	121	183	304	1639	1943	49	1470	$95	11%	1470	0	
AL	87	273	256	529	1447	1976	48	1308	$130	9%	1339	1570	
AL	88	275	402	677	1443	2120	52	1333	$134		1364	1730	1650
AL	89	282	495	777	1405	2182	53	1295	$143	9%	1326	1830	1650
AL	90	289	488	777	1408	2185	53	1298	$145		1329	1839	1650
AL	91	295	585	880	1258	2138	52	1258	$169	8%	1288	2021	1321
AL	92	296	641	937	1301	2238	53	1272	$187		1304	2184	1300
AL	93	361	679	1040	1263	2303	54	1234	$187		1266	2184	1300
AL	94	591	711	1302	1142	2444	58	1113	$204	6%	1145	2900	1300
AL	95	821	743	1564	940	2504	59	940	$217		972	2949	162
AL	96	852	712	1564	831	2395	56	800	$252	2%	825	3415	162











ALASKA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
AK	77	53	17	70	173	243	60	105	$116	65%	135	0	
AK	82	122	38	160	88	248	57	88	$197	36%	118	0	
AK	87	202	45	247	83	330	61	60	$301	1%	93	0	
AK	88	237	45	282	57	339	65	57	$311		107	0	50
AK	89	244	45	289	57	346	66	57	$321	2%	97	0	50
AK	90	254	45	299	58	357	63	58	$321		98	0	48
AK	91	291	37	328	51	379	66	51	$321	0%	91	0	48
AK	92	360	37	397	46	443	82	46	$340	0%	86	0	48
AK	93	432	54	486	45	531	96	45	$355	0%	85	0	37
AK	94	458	70	528	38	566	94	38	$397	0%	78	32	35
AK	95	468	70	538	28	566	90	28	$466		68	127	32
AK	96	492	73	565	19	584	90	19	$453		59	190	28











ARIZONA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
AZ	77	120	116	236	1216	1452	63	1013	$34	46%	0	0	
AZ	82	689	137	826	907	1733	61	572	$124	17%	0	0	
AZ	87	1571	225	1796	423	2219	65	423	$175	6%	0	0	
AZ	88	1631	198	1829	388	2217	64	388	$209		0	0	30
AZ	89	1930	65	1995	380	2375	67	340	$209	1%	69	0	33
AZ	90	2120	65	2185	409	2594	68	269	$218		156	0	43
AZ	91	2263	91	2354	238	2592	69	193	$213	1%	145	3794	89
AZ	92	2290	94	2384	214	2598	67	178	$210		214	4832	89
AZ	93	2373	95	2468	170	2638	66	125	$210		298	6071	85
AZ	94	2459	85	2544	168	2712	68	123	$222	1%	339	6773	83
AZ	95	2496	81	2577	230	2807	69	123	$220		200	7117	49
AZ	96	2403	108	2511	186	2697	65	103	$231		193	7727	67











ARKANSAS

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
AR	77	12	134	146	1767	1913	89	1682	$26	62%	1385	0	
AR	82	42	148	190	1505	1695	74	1354	$73	39%	1420	0	
AR	87	117	338	455	1471	1926	81	1337	$100	25%	1461	0	
AR	88	200	537	737	1563	2300	96	1302	$112		1453	0	800
AR	89	202	432	634	1441	2075	86	1302	$119	21%	1441	0	600
AR	90	286	631	917	1243	2160	90	1243	$135		1340	91	850
AR	91	228	773	1001	1403	2404	101	1265	$145	19%	1565	196	1100
AR	92	300	854	1154	1555	2709	111	1248	$149		1737	415	1300
AR	93	353	791	1144	1591	2735	111	1244	$156		1724	453	1290
AR	94	369	834	1203	1443	2646	109	1258	$154	13%	1743	429	1290
AR	95	383	823	1206	1487	2693	109	1263	$157		1563	469	1290
AR	96	503	823	1326	1496	2822	113	1272	$167	12%	1572	472	0











CALIFORNIA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
CA	77	6942	1947	8889	17291	26180	120	9737	$55	39%	0	0	
CA	82	8759	2592	11351	15715	27066	109	7924	$110	19%	10374	0	
CA	87	14502	3347	17849	11054	28903	105	6880	$184	17%	11457	3027	
CA	88	14489	2968	17457	13540	30997	109	6826	$166		10871	2493	869
CA	89	15339	3052	18391	13143	31534	109	6796	$213	15%	10978	3355	880
CA	90	16063	3043	19106	12653	31759	104	6788	$202		10890	3628	978
CA	91	17046	3074	20120	12331	32451	107	6692	$219	13%	11376	3360	1075
CA	92	22551	3040	25591	11769	37360	123	6572	$219		10923	3360	1270
CA	93	23373	3134	26507	11683	38190	124	6336	$219		11025	11085	1984
CA	94	27822	3328	31150	11551	42701	137	6343	$219	10%	12781	13266	1620
CA	95	30005	3098	33103	10113	43216	133	5106	$240		12125	19101	1248
CA	96	31804	2927	34731	9147	43878	133	4581	$302	7%	10233	29133	1248

Persons by Home Size in Years 1982 and 1996



ICF/MR + HCBS Recipients



State Institution Residents



Proportion of Children/Youth Among State Institution Population



Daily Costs Per Person of State Institutions



COLORADO

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
CO	77	119	421	540	2111	2651	101	1539	$33	45%	4537	0	
CO	82	199	670	869	1960	2829	93	1264	$78	38%	2017	0	
CO	87	354	1345	1699	1247	2946	89	901	$130	17%	1247	1389	
CO	88	429	1722	2151	875	3026	92	529	$128		1149	1621	482
CO	89	664	1581	2245	839	3084	93	493	$141	13%	1115	1679	459
CO	90	1464	958	2422	709	3131	92	429	$157		974	1841	415
CO	91	1819	910	2729	666	3395	99	386	$194	9%	927	1993	428
CO	92	2248	862	3110	484	3594	107	276	$204		754	2204	369
CO	93	2479	754	3233	468	3701	109	264	$223		737	2407	333
CO	94	2814	642	3456	420	3876	109	248	$235		420	2684	339
CO	95	3064	765	3829	294	4123	111	241	$235		307	3316	331
CO	96	2929	593	3522	233	3755	99	197	$290	7%	245	3976	258











CONNECTICUT

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
CT	77	251	364	615	3881	4496	145	3374	$33	28%	687	0	
CT	82	353	540	893	3660	4553	144	3216	$74	17%	1598	0	
CT	87	1630	806	2436	2384	4820	150	2298	$191	12%	1363	0	
CT	88	2201	598	2799	2196	4995	155	2137	$297		1414	644	622
CT	89	2680	557	3237	1900	5137	159	1845	$323	11%	2335	1127	436
CT	90	2568	613	3181	1768	4949	150	1752	$328		1443	1555	450
CT	91	3113	570	3683	1652	5335	162	1652	$333	6%	1550	1655	482
CT	92	3022	582	3604	1567	5171	157	1567	$338		1378	1693	476
CT	93	3569	548	4117	1414	5531	167	1414	$343		1272	2069	454
CT	94	3689	540	4229	1342	5571	170	1342	$353	1%	1276	2361	419
CT	95	4123	435	4558	1290	5848	179	1290	NA		1265	2542	403
CT	96	4154	400	4554	1209	5763	176	1209	$357		1298	2999	394











176

177

DELAWARE

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
DE	77	179	9	188	622	810	139	546	$28	35%	477	0	
DE	82	148	10	158	606	764	127	513	$64	16%	513	0	
DE	87	248	49	297	383	680	106	383	$107	6%	444	81	
DE	88	249	65	314	374	688	104	374	$127		439	144	305
DE	89	239	86	325	356	681	101	356	$160	9%	442	100	89
DE	90	272	92	364	342	706	104	342	$167		434	196	70
DE	91	278	89	367	332	699	103	332	$177	8%	421	245	60
DE	92	304	71	375	325	700	100	325	$210		325	290	60
DE	93	327	53	380	370	750	105	324	$201		370	290	0
DE	94	350	55	405	320	725	101	320	$219		356	310	0
DE	95	361	61	422	307	729	102	307	$232		313	356	0
DE	96	421	31	452	291	743	102	284	$263	2%	300	352	0











DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
DC	77	28	0	28	960	988	143	923	NA	18%	0	0	
DC	82	139	76	215	671	886	140	611	$90	14%	436	0	
DC	87	496	235	731	258	989	159	258	$165	9%	633	0	
DC	88	505	224	729	277	1006	163	256	$235		666	0	85
DC	89	533	298	831	235	1066	176	235	$245	1%	641	0	55
DC	90	514	275	789	265	1054	176	265	$245		612	0	45
DC	91	646	304	950	137	1087	182	77	$260	0%	1027	0	34
DC	92	689	356	1045	76	1121	188	76	$260		761	0	34
DC	93	693	357	1050	76	1126	189	76	$260		804	0	0
DC	94	721	363	1084	0	1084	188	0	NA		722	0	0
DC	95	706	369	1075	0	1075	192	0	NA		754	0	0
DC	96	691	374	1065	0	1065	192	0	NA	0%	754	0	28











180

181

FLORIDA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
FL	77	791	1008	1799	6304	8103	96	4660	$37	53%	370	0	
FL	82	937	1474	2411	5649	8060	77	3334	$76	21%	2128	0	
FL	87	593	2654	3247	4952	8199	69	2061	$117	17%	3152	2631	
FL	88	328	3142	3470	4900	8370	68	2019	$135		3180	2631	143
FL	89	1491	2230	3721	4775	8496	67	1999	$142	11%	3180	2542	126
FL	90	1674	2287	3961	4671	8632	65	2016	$158		3179	2615	200
FL	91	1987	2244	4231	4628	8859	67	1977	$164	4%	3187	2631	212
FL	92	2219	2110	4329	4397	8726	64	1871	$167		3118	2637	212
FL	93	2634	2007	4641	4418	9059	65	1744	$175		3207	6009	212
FL	94	3292	1834	5126	4281	9407	69	1735	$187	2%	3407	6430	212
FL	95	4072	1670	5742	4265	10007	70	1733	$203		3530	7988	212
FL	96	4539	1572	6111	3877	9988	69	1459	$217	6%	3442	10000	0











GEORGIA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
GA	77	96	236	332	2994	3326	66	2807	$55	39%	2369	0	
GA	82	709	138	847	2710	3557	63	2460	$98	20%	2491	0	
GA	87	1181	61	1242	2227	3469	56	2089	$155	10%	1949	0	
GA	88	1351	43	1394	2267	3661	58	2058	$190		1913	0	2050
GA	89	1362	42	1404	2319	3723	58	2079	$201	15%	1944	25	2000
GA	90	1519	25	1544	2300	3844	58	2057	$202		1932	160	2000
GA	91	1608	11	1619	2292	3911	59	2054	$204	13%	1942	353	1941
GA	92	1482	14	1496	2152	3648	53	2042	$197		1935	359	1941
GA	93*	1482	14	1496	2146	3642	52	2036	$197		1933	359	1941
GA	94	1538	0	1538	2101	3639	53	1991	$197	10%	1897	556	2200
GA	95	1537	0	1537	2085	3622	51	1975	$213		1880	848	2200
GA	96	1538	0	1538	2019	3557	49	1909	DNF	10%	2019	1619	2200











HAWAII

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
HI	77	366	18	384	543	927	101	524	$44		524	0	
HI	82	445	12	457	400	857	86	379	$91	33%	387	0	
HI	87	576	5	581	260	841	78	260	$150	13%	297	56	
HI	88	747	6	253	210	963	88	210	$193		296	78	66
HI	89	917	8	925	173	1098	99	173	$199	13%	246	70	39
HI	90*	917	8	925	165	1090	99	165	$243		220	123	38
HI	91	948	7	955	146	1101	97	137	$335	17%	386	189	138
HI	92	978	6	984	130	1114	94	115	$354		154	452	138
HI	93	913	7	920	106	1026	85	86	$365		117	450	135
HI	94	915	7	922	96	1018	84	84	$365	9%	142	513	95
HI	95	924	7	931	97	1028	84	82	$371		132	491	69
HI	96	1070	7	1077	63	1140	92	49	$388	0%	127	517	87











IDAHO

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
ID	77	42	76	118	698	816	95	453	$38	35%	583	0	
ID	82	41	180	221	639	860	89	350	$91	29%	482	0	
ID	87	242	531	773	521	1294	129	263	$124	11%	445	55	
ID	88	282	539	821	491	1312	131	236	$218		461	201	75
ID	89	300	494	794	345	1339	132	221	$220	9%	520	270	48
ID	90	319	443	762	487	1249	125	202	$222		468	346	67
ID	91	342	475	817	469	1286	125	172	$302	13%	535	165	83
ID	92	511	482	993	360	1353	133	160	$325		519	225	89
ID	93	668	534	1202	320	1522	149	148	$358		494	174	89
ID	94	779	505	1284	336	1620	147	143	$351	9%	527	333	73
ID	95	782	570	1352	284	1636	142	133	$378		540	362	32
ID	96	1208	521	1729	442	2171	184	123	$392	12%	538	415	39











188

183

ILLINOIS

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
IL	77	69	101	170	13228	13398	119	6394	$54	39%	5353	0	
IL	82	331	387	718	12170	12888	113	5250	$96	30%	8144	0	
IL	87	713	1707	2420	10425	12845	111	4436	$134	10%	9400	664	
IL	88	904	2653	3557	11700	15257	131	4482	$140		10346	637	3000
IL	89	927	3024	3951	11215	15166	130	4497	$145	11%	10864	680	3200
IL	90	910	3114	4024	11336	15360	134	4459	$159		11008	724	3590
IL	91	897	3824	4721	11824	16545	143	4340	$174	6%	11943	1338	2183
IL	92	719	2876	3595	12697	16292	139	4303	$177		12311	2006	1976
IL	93	783	2827	3610	12419	16029	136	4006	$186		12160	2850	1659
IL	94	1738	3836	5574	10194	15768	135	3726	$196	5%	10979	3690	1750
IL	95	3843	3847	7690	7636	15326	129	3716	$200		10935	3761	2939
IL	96	2416	3442	5858	7219	13077	110	3718	$221	5%	10416	5267	2872











INDIANA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
IN	77	466	172	638	4218	4856	91	3438	$40	31%	1026	0	
IN	82	487	243	730	3231	3961	72	2388	$65	17%	2798	0	
IN	87	914	1609	2523	2863	5386	98	2270	$114	10%	4068	0	
IN	88	728	2418	3146	2578	5724	103	2015	$126		4690	0	2500
IN	89	1687	2022	3709	3101	6810	122	2122	$138	10%	5512	0	2200
IN	90	1700	2132	3832	2341	6173	110	2077	$146		4930	0	3300
IN	91	2015	2424	4439	2648	7087	126	1756	$175	4%	6048	0	2587
IN	92	2330	2716	5046	2578	7624	135	1696	$213		6234	0	2135
IN	93	2350	2799	5149	2462	7611	134	1491	$217		6213	447	2047
IN	94	2506	2791	5297	2329	7626	133	1384	$219	5%	6224	529	2047
IN	95	2589	2817	5406	2478	7884	137	1327	$220		6176	594	2057
IN	96	2556	2820	5376	2228	7604	130	1244	$238	1%	5986	816	2057











192

193

IOWA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
IA	77	94	296	390	3109	3499	122	1489	$48	43%	1432	0	
IA	82	211	588	799	3742	4541	156	1684	$65	16%	1673	0	
IA	87	466	702	1168	2183	3351	119	1057	$136	12%	1734	4	
IA	88	988	1177	2165	2252	4417	156	1056	$144		1840	12	532
IA	89	1065	1325	2390	2145	4535	160	1016	$149	10%	1818	14	986
IA	90	1653	1377	3030	3111	6141	219	976	$172		2512	5	1484
IA	91	1860	1571	3431	2997	6428	230	941	$178	9%	2132	19	1379
IA	92	1872	1650	3522	2611	6133	221	869	$192		2088	137	1562
IA	93	1984	1907	3891	2086	5977	217	824	$203		1890	170	1562
IA	94	2106	1984	4090	1949	6039	215	752	$226	7%	1818	879	1562
IA	95	2283	1979	4262	1953	6215	217	693	$248		1909	1669	98
IA	96	2831	1994	4825	3223	8048	280	672	$271	11%	2182	2575	148











KANSAS

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
KS	77	220	406	626	2080	2706	116	1460	$49	52%	1610	0	
KS	82	184	482	666	2209	2875	119	1371	$78	46%	2078	0	
KS	87	613	555	1168	1974	3142	127	1298	$123	31%	2161	135	
KS	88	840	467	1307	1918	3225	130	1237	$145		2081	185	60
KS	89	885	1019	1904	1710	2974	118	1070	$148	25%	1955	314	35
KS	90	885	379	1264	1694	2958	118	1017	$190		1979	361	33
KS	91	764	533	1297	1698	2995	120	1021	$200	23%	2015	497	31
KS	92*	764	533	1297	1627	2924	115	927	$212		1921	555	29
KS	93	660	900	1560	1547	3007	119	876	$219		1837	1066	0
KS	94	584	941	1525	1477	3002	119	806	$232	17%	1767	1339	0
KS	95	584	941	1525	1352	2877	113	732	$254		1642	1613	0
KS	96	546	831	1377	1406	2783	106	676	$277		1586	3146	0











196

197

KENTUCKY

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
KY	77	44	29	73	1585	1658	48	789	$69	56%	999	0	
KY	82	112	63	175	1685	1860	51	811	$89	40%	1250	0	
KY	87	327	103	430	1199	1629	44	786	$131	24%	1199	609	
KY	88	471	110	581	1270	1851	50	757	$149		1187	652	487
KY	89	483	137	620	1245	1865	50	732	$142	14%	1179	728	400
KY	90	616	127	743	1240	1983	54	727	$163		1191	743	300
KY	91	747	150	897	1244	2141	58	731	$200	11%	1191	762	217
KY	92	747	152	899	1244	2143	57	731	$200		1200	819	217
KY	93*	747	152	899	1133	2032	54	620	$205		1053	855	217
KY	94	738	189	927	1163	2090	55	620	$205	8%	1133	887	0
KY	95	837	189	1026	1257	2283	59	688	$217		1201	879	0
KY	96	1002	234	1236	1173	2409	62	644	$227	5%	1157	924	0











LOUISIANA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
LA	77	39	112	151	4298	4449	113	3246	$30	47%	3682	0	
LA	82	85	185	270	4785	5055	116	3514	$68	35%	4849	0	
LA	87	914	291	1205	4436	5641	125	2889	$100	24%	5274	0	
LA	88	1888	101	1989	4441	6430	146	2789	$92		6016	0	1200
LA	89	1889	123	2012	4390	6402	146	2738	$93	21%	6067	0	1200
LA	90	1990	146	2136	4167	6303	148	2554	$124		5841	0	1306
LA	91	2224	222	2446	4418	6864	185	2408	$147	17%	5951	56	1252
LA	92	2282	387	2669	4274	6943	183	2334	$156		5645	939	1244
LA	93	2340	387	2727	4226	6953	184	2286	$170		5678	1134	1244
LA	94	2609	882	3491	4211	7702	179	2126	$164	12%	6029	1543	1243
LA	95	2892	1034	3926	3929	7855	181	2116	$172		6044	1926	1243
LA	96	3176	1187	4363	3648	8011	183	2031	$191	10%	6102	2100	1267











200

201

MAINE

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
ME	77	429	75	504	989	1493	138	481	$48	33%	310	0	
ME	82	524	179	703	761	1464	129	364	$111	21%	630	0	
ME	87	1165	140	1305	568	1873	158	290	$188	13%	688	400	
ME	88	1187	164	1351	611	1962	163	290	$207		677	450	168
ME	89	1201	153	1354	586	1940	159	279	$209	17%	668	453	162
ME	90	1205	170	1375	572	1947	158	265	$220		654	454	162
ME	91	1259	187	1446	572	2018	162	265	$249	8%	656	509	190
ME	92	1212	203	1415	548	1963	156	241	$270		630	509	230
ME	93	1172	253	1425	548	1973	155	241	$270		630	509	230
ME	94	1079	307	1386	267	1653	133	137	$265		542	742	154
ME	95	1088	298	1386	191	1577	128	61	$237		487	742	45
ME	96	1088	310	1398	149	1547	125	19	$265	0%	445	1000	45











MARYLAND

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MD	77	62	71	133	3238	3371	81	2926	$36	37%	1367	0	
MD	82	352	163	515	2731	3246	76	2421	$65	23%	1851	0	
MD	87	2368	256	2624	1532	4156	92	1452	$148	15%	1464	685	
MD	88	2802	11	2813	1498	4311	93	1418	$164		1429	716	300
MD	89	2919	12	2931	1442	4373	93	1362	$166	11%	1374	813	300
MD	90	2950	8	2958	1330	4288	88	1250	$190		1258	858	440
MD	91	3325	0	3325	1159	4484	92	1079	$200	8%	1079	1082	537
MD	92	3489	0	3489	1129	4618	94	954	$210		954	1972	665
MD	93	3806	0	3806	1069	4875	97	894	$237		894	2437	690
MD	94	3970	0	3970	1013	4983	100	822	$250		822	2787	738
MD	95	4289	363	4652	846	5498	108	775	$267		775	2898	558
MD	96	3848	353	4201	726	4927	96	652	$288	5%	652	3306	336











204

205

MASSACHUSETTS

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MA	77	282	1012	1294	6429	7723	134	5616	$37	21%	4242	0	
MA	82	911	1129	2040	4682	6722	116	3931	$138	9%	3971	0	
MA	87	1104	2658	3762	3430	7192	123	3367	$251	2%	3698	593	
MA	88	857	2905	3762	3430	7192	122	3367	$251		3698	593	1192
MA	89	2224	2780	5004	3277	8281	140	3026	$325	1%	3548	1210	1279
MA	90	3541	1744	5285	2800	8085	135	2800	$273		3360	1539	1600
MA	91	3440	1661	5101	2694	7795	130	2694	$344	1%	3272	1700	1600
MA	92*	3440	1661	5101	2694	7795	131	2694	$360		3304	3288	1600
MA	93	3611	1936	5547	2694	8241	138	2614	$435		3520	3288	1735
MA	94	4691	1874	6565	2419	8984	149	2119	$407	0%	2119	5130	1823
MA	95	5183	1837	7020	2407	9427	158	2019	$402		1990	7800	1769
MA	96	6093	1364	7457	1824	9280	155	1824	$424	0%	1795	8027	1828











MICHIGAN

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MI	77	1306	2341	3647	9002	12649	139	6100	$47	35%	5760	0	
MI	82	3529	1868	5397	5705	11102	122	3173	$132	16%	4002	0	
MI	87	4934	572	5506	2333	7839	85	1658	$199	9%	3425	3	
MI	88	5778	0	5778	2016	7794	84	1436	$227		3683	580	2200
MI	89	6012	0	6012	1780	7792	84	1237	$238	7%	2959	1292	1900
MI	90	7164	0	7164	1453	8617	92	1044	$251		3073	1658	1900
MI	91	7513	0	7513	1013	8526	91	760	$276	6%	2850	2122	1800
MI	92	7913	0	7913	630	8543	92	630	$300		3180	2741	1550
MI	93	8444	0	8444	514	8958	96	514	$297		3342	2885	1550
MI	94	8719	0	8719	411	9130	96	411	$304	7%	3366	3367	1550
MI	95	10444	0	10444	392	10836	113	392	$311		3375	3842	748
MI	96	11557	0	11557	346	11903	124	346	$383	12%	3185	5207	748











MINNESOTA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MN	77	286	911	1197	4985	6182	156	3032	$44	37%	5303	0	
MN	82	652	1805	2457	4612	7069	171	2417	$89	17%	6899	0	
MN	87	2627	2390	5017	3772	8789	207	1653	$158	4%	6549	1423	
MN	88	3483	2009	5492	3664	9156	213	1471	$195		6339	1896	871
MN	89	3543	1949	5492	3329	8821	203	1410	$191	2%	5769	2068	961
MN	90	3815	1874	5689	3216	8905	201	1337	$208		5635	2184	850
MN	91	4310	1853	6163	3027	9190	208	1148	$233	2%	5316	2551	827
MN	92	5469	1852	7321	2618	9939	224	1033	$288		5202	2890	884
MN	93	5898	1858	7756	2544	10300	232	875	$288		5072	3408	750
MN	94	6615	1911	8526	2163	10689	237	751	$310	3%	4838	4385	750
MN	95	7344	1910	9254	1793	11047	239	524	$324		4455	4897	1008
MN	96	7896	1674	9570	1420	10990	236	345	$355	3%	3826	5422	1144











MISSISSIPPI

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MS	77	17	102	119	2055	2174	91	1666	$23	32%	491	0	
MS	82	67	210	277	2201	2478	97	1756	$53	29%	1614	0	
MS	87	205	112	317	2127	2444	92	1522	$60	22%	1603	0	
MS	88	286	63	349	2110	2459	94	1505	$75		1678	0	280
MS	89	262	74	336	2078	2414	92	1483	$75	18%	1588	0	280
MS	90	283	99	382	2086	2468	95	1501	$85		1716	0	280
MS	91	310	115	425	2081	2506	97	1496	$94	16%	1820	0	300
MS	92	362	142	504	2070	2574	96	1485	$101		1825	0	300
MS	93	395	214	609	2155	2764	103	1470	$118		2038	0	840
MS	94	409	303	712	2124	2836	107	1439	$127	15%	2077	0	975
MS	95	433	292	725	2027	2752	103	1467	$136		2059	0	975
MS	96	467	292	759	2049	2808	105	1424	$144	20%	2126	65	0











212

213

MISSOURI

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MO	77	599	1059	1658	4847	6505	135	2308	$46	33%	2051	0	
MO	82	740	1180	1920	4331	6251	126	2018	$84	23%	1878	0	
MO	87	848	1432	2280	3671	5951	117	1874	$118	14%	2148	0	
MO	88	957	1656	2613	2809	5422	105	1889	$124		1868	0	1468
MO	89	1058	1778	2836	2835	5671	110	1885	$130	14%	1858	338	1440
MO	90	1201	1832	3033	2774	5807	113	1863	$163		2034	989	1400
MO	91	1368	1700	3068	2804	5872	114	1703	$168	12%	2008	1452	1400
MO	92	1801	1937	3738	2602	6340	120	1554	$168		1751	2241	1400
MO	93	2056	1862	3918	2400	6318	119	1492	$173		1709	2622	1463
MO	94	2384	1463	3847	2371	6218	119	1500	$184		1709	3057	1267
MO	95	2540	1441	3981	2291	6272	119	1484	$184		1678	3511	1240
MO	96	2984	1315	4299	2219	6518	123	1494	$200	6%	1643	5685	1125











MONTANA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
MT	77	86	339	425	340	765	101	321	$75	32%	0	0	
MT	82	93	415	508	273	781	98	273	$119	19%	290	21	
MT	87	352	561	913	254	1167	143	254	$143	7%	264	210	
MT	88	476	502	978	243	1221	152	243	$154		253	286	300
MT	89	513	559	1072	240	1312	163	240	$164	5%	250	274	231
MT	90	511	553	1064	235	1299	162	235	$175		245	276	237
MT	91	615	523	1138	199	1337	165	190	$199	5%	197	355	232
MT	92	659	648	1307	162	1469	186	162	$204		170	444	224
MT	93	787	516	1303	157	1460	186	157	$203		165	504	184
MT	94	778	531	1309	163	1472	175	163	$233		171	546	158
MT	95	828	506	1334	157	1491	173	157	$247		165	646	167
MT	96	839	501	1340	157	1497	171	157	$256	3%	165	807	169











216

217

NEBRASKA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NE	77	195	551	746	1553	2299	147	1155	$44	51%	1356	0	
NE	82	344	398	742	980	1722	109	582	$85	23%	980	0	
NE	87	950	399	1349	816	2165	136	472	$108	11%	816	0	
NE	88	1293	308	1601	800	2401	150	472	$113		808	553	353
NE	89	1298	308	1606	748	2354	171	469	$111	8%	756	540	353
NE	90	1369	308	1677	722	2399	175	472	$117		731	658	489
NE	91	1399	308	1707	717	2424	152	463	$134	6%	719	683	613
NE	92	896	217	1113	731	1844	115	460	$155		739	710	649
NE	93	900	218	1118	713	1831	115	460	$181		721	991	649
NE	94	900	208	1108	686	1794	112	439	$175	4%	694	1257	649
NE	95	841	275	1116	669	1785	109	419	$177		678	1169	0
NE	96	1453	240	1693	641	2334	141	401	$204	4%	650	1834	0











NEVADA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NV	77	61	20	81	166	247	39	166	$57	24%	0	0	
NV	82	116	25	141	160	301	34	160	$112	41%	175	0	
NV	87	120	138	258	175	433	44	175	$145	29%	190	129	
NV	88	263	29	292	173	465	44	173	$162		188	117	61
NV	89	340	15	355	170	525	47	170	$190	26%	185	136	40
NV	90	368	15	383	177	560	44	177	$202		192	133	57
NV	91	389	15	404	173	577	45	173	$215	26%	212	135	31
NV	92	391	15	406	162	568	47	166	$233		146	136	24
NV	93	435	15	450	150	600	49	146	$250		208	186	15
NV	94	458	0	458	150	608	44	145	$264		205	172	7
NV	95	473	0	473	142	615	42	142	$268		214	278	6
NV	96	476	19	495	158	653	43	154	$275	18%	232	361	32











220

221

NEW HAMPSHIRE

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NH	77	62	81	143	694	837	99	664	$25	39%	288	0	
NH	82	152	141	293	651	944	99	621	$66	11%	339	0	
NH	87	648	265	913	181	1094	103	160	$215	2%	265	541	
NH	88	737	194	931	144	1075	99	144	$226		204	634	25
NH	89	809	199	1008	118	1126	102	118	$249	2%	158	762	11
NH	90	1055	140	1195	76	1271	116	51	$301		113	822	13
NH	91	1147	132	1279	25	1304	118	0	NA		91	955	26
NH	92	1177	147	1324	23	1347	113	0	NA		81	1059	108
NH	93	1259	115	1874	23	1397	118	0	NA		74	1032	108
NH	94	1341	92	1433	23	1456	124	0	NA	0%	73	1303	108
NH	95	1425	70	1495	22	1517	131	0	NA		72	1570	107
NH	96	1505	58	1563	22	1585	139	0	NA	0%	22	1906	101











NEW JERSEY

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NJ	77	280	197	477	8836	9313	127	7961	$25	50%	525	0	
NJ	82	1076	439	1515	7216	8731	117	6304	$68	15%	4366	0	
NJ	87	2556	462	3018	5376	8394	109	5304	$117	8%	3829	2596	
NJ	88	2382	640	3022	5304	8326	108	5234	$168		3815	2873	2479
NJ	89	2747	573	3320	5215	8535	110	5143	$197	7%	3822	3170	962
NJ	90	3799	214	4013	5298	9311	120	5069	$194		3818	3270	962
NJ	91	3954	0	3954	5381	9335	120	4932	$194	5%	3818	3655	210
NJ	92	3924	0	3924	5465	9389	119	4643	$223		3942	3971	313
NJ	93	4043	0	4043	5547	9590	120	4407	$233		3892	4191	286
NJ	94	4440	0	4440	5490	9930	126	4363	$249	1%	3975	4729	371
NJ	95	4650	0	4650	5199	9849	124	4286	$264		4060	5033	352
NJ	96	4505	533	5038	4931	9969	125	4241	$204	1%	4091	5242	371











224

225

NEW MEXICO

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NM	77	113	100	213	581	794	67	547	$34	27%	426	0	
NM	82	139	155	294	552	846	62	503	$93	33%	553	0	
NM	87	423	479	902	500	1402	92	500	$107	22%	633	220	
NM	88	389	483	872	507	1379	92	507	$120		709	134	86
NM	89	318	414	732	528	1260	82	503	$123	18%	751	135	88
NM	90*	318	414	732	522	1254	81	497	$148		730	160	88
NM	91	396	360	756	505	1261	81	473	$148	17%	706	160	88
NM	92	488	305	793	482	1275	81	482	$196		730	334	121
NM	93	493	272	765	461	1226	77	445	$208		681	612	121
NM	94	862	242	1104	264	1368	64	349	$324	10%	585	802	121
NM	95	1231	212	1443	226	1669	59	210	$288		525	1243	141
NM	96	1602	181	1783	255	2038	120	145	$288		485	1553	138











226

227

NEW YORK

Persons with MR/DD by Home Size

State	Year	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NY	77	3496	1817	5313	21239	26552	148	18446	$48	36%	18601	0	
NY	82	4271	5609	9880	15437	25317	143	12837	$100	16%	15577	0	
NY	87	7506	8537	16043	11274	27317	154	10022	$239	8%	17290	0	
NY	88	5262	11472	16734	10800	27534	154	9507	$272		17567	0	800
NY	89	5827	11625	17452	9679	27131	151	8179	$317	5%	17774	0	800
NY	90	6050	13359	19409	8660	28069	155	7508	$329		16961	0	1550
NY	91	6165	15751	21916	8530	30446	168	6489	$338	4%	17812	0	1550
NY	92	6803	16782	23585	7229	30814	172	5694	$350		18497	379	1575
NY	93	7776	17705	25481	5457	30938	173	4933	$350		21850	3398	1454
NY	94	7776	17705	25481	5457	30938	172	4233	$350	1%	16083	18877	1454
NY	95	9014	17633	26647	5475	32122	178	4161	$355		12386	23199	1454
NY	96	11946	17562	29508	4808	34316	189	3399	$355	3%	11846	27272	8454











NORTH CAROLINA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
NC	77	239	153	392	4032	4424	80	3753	$45	23%	2073	0	
NC	82	484	179	663	3778	4441	74	3451	$96	23%	2762	0	
NC	87	992	237	1229	3261	4490	70	2720	$156	8%	3227	328	
NC	88	1506	286	1792	3391	5183	80	2845	$152		3445	405	316
NC	89	1771	265	2036	3321	5357	82	2715	$160	6%	3173	553	316
NC	90	2029	265	2294	3173	5467	81	2567	$165		3799	731	316
NC	91	2643	251	2894	3134	6028	89	2528	$186	5%	4378	780	465
NC	92	2848	333	3181	3141	6322	92	2606	$188		4502	939	465
NC	93	3133	604	3737	3083	6820	98	2469	$199		4662	1190	465
NC	94	3245	711	3956	2937	6893	99	2378	$225	3%	4732	1318	300
NC	95	3506	751	4257	2788	7045	99	2229	$229		4595	1818	850
NC	96	3646	751	4397	2786	7183	99	2227	$228	2%	4593	3098	850











NORTH DAKOTA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
ND	77	23	47	70	1306	1376	211	1145	DNF	21%	0	0	
ND	82	12	146	158	1076	1234	184	941	$66	12%	219	0	
ND	87	269	702	971	441	1412	209	398	$197	14%	892	724	
ND	88	412	721	1133	383	1516	227	316	$236		888	824	289
ND	89	752	670	1422	316	1738	263	251	$236	13%	743	1063	194
ND	90	923	662	1585	277	1862	293	228	$272		671	1055	187
ND	91	965	595	1560	278	1838	289	211	$277	11%	634	1163	182
ND	92	1002	579	1581	272	1853	286	207	$253		476	1334	168
ND	93	1049	562	1611	265	1876	292	203	$321		618	1362	170
ND	94	1093	535	1628	226	1854	292	146	$346	11%	551	1509	167
ND	95	1156	477	1633	224	1857	292	160	$350		561	1637	151
ND	96	1122	503	1625	262	1887	296	148	$339	8%	624	1770	175











232

233

OHIO

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
OH	77	620	768	1388	9429	10817	101	7126	$32	83%	2488	0	
OH	82	1347	1587	2934	7938	10872	101	4186	$92	13%	6040	0	
OH	87	2168	2270	4438	6860	11298	105	2900	$164	6%	7691	100	
OH	88	2694	2882	5576	7506	13082	121	2888	$188		7535	134	4756
OH	89	2877	2828	5705	7341	13046	120	2807	$207	5%	7971	240	2950
OH	90	2988	2929	5917	7308	13225	121	2636	$207		7991	245	3073
OH	91	3707	2993	6700	6907	13607	124	2449	$205	3%	8220	302	2823
OH	92	3733	3140	6873	6691	13564	124	2359	$217		8384	397	2600
OH	93	4251	3040	7291	6470	13761	126	2243	$242		8222	1120	2451
OH	94	4546	2714	7260	6052	13312	120	2179	$242	2%	7821	2399	2382
OH	95	6504	3062	9566	5874	15440	138	2131	$270		7781	2593	2288
OH	96	6619	3099	9718	5773	15491	138	2087	$255	1%	7756	2593	2169











OKLAHOMA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
OK	77	11	19	30	3082	3112	111	1978	$34	44%	1978	0	
OK	82	6	86	92	2920	3012	95	1803	$60	69%	1803	0	
OK	87	393	424	817	3014	3831	116	1276	$150	49%	2939	70	
OK	88	403	401	804	3242	4046	125	1186	$175		3242	178	1400
OK	89	509	372	881	3045	3926	122	1019	$175	39%	3060	500	1200
OK	90	494	298	792	2894	3686	116	994	$235		2894	621	1200
OK	91	720	283	1003	3306	4309	136	937	$235	28%	2916	844	1850
OK	92	946	267	1213	2890	4103	131	803	$250		2776	949	1759
OK	93	1140	294	1434	2388	3822	122	719	$279		2415	1287	1500
OK	94	1333	249	1582	2256	3838	119	658	$282	20%	2268	1693	1285
OK	95	1523	263	1786	2252	4038	123	568	$240		2290	1955	930
OK	96	1523	263	1786	2237	4023	122	553	$265	21%	2275	2260	930











OREGON

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
OR	77	49	325	374	2233	2607	110	1781	$40	22%	1989	0	
OR	82	11	490	501	1979	2480	94	1627	$65	26%	1918	1360	
OR	87	1098	568	1666	1476	3142	116	1145	$110	14%	1386	832	
OR	88	1172	606	1778	1527	3305	119	1098	$168		1284	968	285
OR	89	1340	477	1817	1077	2894	103	863	$235	9%	1042	1218	434
OR	90	2169	555	2724	1083	3807	130	804	$301		986	1282	380
OR	91	2344	555	2899	879	3778	129	640	$374		770	2177	452
OR	92	2340	555	2895	773	3668	128	534	$382	5%	668	1458	420
OR	93	2502	555	3057	682	3739	130	527	$389		468	2023	420
OR	94	2620	555	3175	628	3803	125	489	$411	1%	417	2136	420
OR	95	2646	561	3207	634	3841	122	442	$462		442	2500	260
OR	96	2718	561	3279	621	3900	122	429	$499		429	2523	265









PENNSYLVANIA

Persons with MR/DD by Home Size

State	Year	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
PA	77	1078	1310	2388	14318	16706	142	9870	$62	23%	7355	0	
PA	82	2588	1075	3663	11904	15567	131	7124	$110	9%	8598	0	
PA	87	4774	1880	6654	8151	14805	125	5127	$151	4%	7537	1203	
PA	88	6976	509	7485	7536	15021	125	4606	$155		7364	1759	300
PA	89	7015	873	7888	7014	14902	124	4082	$176	2%	7085	1930	466
PA	90	7525	915	8440	6464	14904	125	3940	$189		7116	2221	466
PA	91	7809	813	8622	6289	14911	125	3878	$193	2%	7100	2333	509
PA	92	7949	772	8721	6210	14931	124	3807	$199		7282	2705	607
PA	93	8285	642	8927	6167	15094	125	3671	$226		6768	3795	1544
PA	94	8760	834	9594	6124	15718	130	3563	$225	1%	6950	4303	1544
PA	95	9384	759	10143	5697	15840	131	3392	$249		6800	5525	1544
PA	96	9827	728	10555	5549	16104	132	3164	$257	1%	6469	6076	1544











RHODE ISLAND

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
RI	77	0	98	98	972	1070	114	904	$43	40%	763	0	
RI	82	153	228	381	631	1012	106	613	$113	12%	881	0	
RI	87	316	545	861	312	1173	119	280	$226	3%	994	136	
RI	88	811	312	1123	276	1399	141	261	$245		1093	250	225
RI	89	747	337	1084	242	1326	133	225	$246	0%	956	449	250
RI	90	787	362	1149	233	1382	138	215	$286		809	477	37
RI	91	826	345	1171	196	1367	136	178	$295	1%	766	793	40
RI	92	870	348	1218	158	1376	137	158	$295		602	993	20
RI	93	910	354	1264	131	1395	138	88	$299		457	1192	0
RI	94	932	315	1247	43	1290	129	0	NA	0%	353	1333	0
RI	95	951	369	1320	0	1320	132	0	NA		304	1304	0
RI	96	978	337	1315	0	1315	132	0	NA	0%	225	1914	0











SOUTH CAROLINA

Persons with MR/DD by Home Size

State	Year	1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
SC	77	9	135	144	3982	4126	143	3826	$32	37%	1017	0	
SC	82	3	191	194	3519	3713	116	3322	$56	24%	2665	0	
SC	87	263	988	1251	2610	3861	113	2534	$84	20%	3139	0	
SC	88	465	856	1321	2513	3834	110	2437	$110		3300	0	49
SC	89	587	833	1420	2455	3875	110	2363	$110	17%	3231	0	94
SC	90	876	987	1863	2430	4293	121	2251	$120		3229	0	114
SC	91	927	973	1900	2291	4191	118	2199	$132	15%	3224	0	98
SC	92	981	1066	2047	2227	4274	117	2135	$141		3261	471	98
SC	93	1041	1210	2251	2174	4425	120	2062	$145		3232	586	98
SC	94	1246	1243	2489	1997	4486	123	1885	$145		3111	966	199
SC	95	1374	1153	2527	1735	4262	114	1703	$185		2917	1475	0
SC	96	1650	1087	2737	1626	4363	116	1548	$193	10%	2740	2074	0











244

245

SOUTH DAKOTA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
SD	77	10	242	252	925	1177	171	835	$28	33%	540	0	
SD	82	8	471	479	736	1215	176	601	$60	14%	721	0	
SD	87	248	828	1076	485	1561	221	485	$87	13%	680	596	
SD	88	287	764	1051	434	1485	208	434	$106		650	610	142
SD	89	313	769	1082	405	1487	208	405	$118	10%	591	683	155
SD	90	434	750	1184	382	1566	223	382	$135		568	721	141
SD	91	555	739	1294	378	1672	238	378	$145	9%	549	788	225
SD	92	789	664	1453	385	1838	256	385	$163		552	852	200
SD	93	861	637	1498	352	1850	257	352	$173		504	923	163
SD	94	903	689	1592	351	1943	272	351	$196	5%	502	1004	164
SD	95	936	679	1615	338	1953	266	338	$203		440	1157	175
SD	96	989	684	1673	252	1925	259	252	$214	0%	349	1295	169











TENNESSEE

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
TN	77	210	495	705	2500	3205	75	2111	$45	41%	2149	0	
TN	82	343	729	1072	2456	3528	76	2163	$71	25%	2377	0	
TN	87	708	778	1486	2308	3794	78	2074	$102	12%	2289	213	
TN	88	482	1014	1496	2243	3739	76	2017	$110		2198	351	930
TN	89	569	1136	1705	2189	3894	79	1963	$128	14%	2175	474	900
TN	90	621	1283	1904	2175	4079	82	1949	$126		2256	581	1200
TN	91	654	1401	2055	2167	4222	85	1941	$133	14%	2380	579	1180
TN	92	641	1402	2043	2161	4204	82	1935	$135		2399	704	1140
TN	93	657	1500	2157	2032	4189	81	1810	$140		2328	587	1014
TN	94	753	1497	2250	1928	4178	82	1784	$156	10%	2350	964	903
TN	95	932	1490	2422	1754	4176	80	1602	$196		2219	1399	704
TN	96	1216	1461	2677	1532	4209	80	1388	$267	6%	2028	3021	1351











248

249

TEXAS

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
TX	77	101	434	535	14370	14905	116	12114	$48	41%	10486	0	
TX	82	76	1053	1129	14634	15763	103	10761	$59	26%	13959	0	
TX	87	910	1104	2014	10894	12908	76	7936	$98	16%	11903	70	
TX	88	1389	1168	2557	10713	13270	79	7933	$102		12211	412	3500
TX	89	1183	967	2150	10168	12318	72	7933	$113	12%	12081	417	3500
TX	90	1207	965	2172	9834	12006	69	7320	$148		11262	485	4200
TX	91	1987	793	2780	9660	12440	72	6880	$153	10%	10771	973	3258
TX	92	2634	939	3573	8614	12187	71	6650	$167		11187	968	3258
TX	93	3562	939	4501	7940	12441	72	6736	$167		12143	968	3258
TX	94	4023	978	5001	7841	12842	71	6124	$168	4%	13742	1564	3258
TX	95	5236	885	6121	7815	13936	75	5855	$162		12772	2728	3258
TX	96	4263	904	5167	8057	13224	70	5735	$182	5%	13224	3658	3258











UTAH

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
UT	77	68	95	163	1217	1380	113	849	$33	45%	1193	0	
UT	82	50	145	195	1155	1350	111	742	$68	33%	1199	0	
UT	87	349	211	560	1135	1695	100	554	$120	22%	1151	0	
UT	88	347	442	789	948	1737	103	533	$121		945	1022	389
UT	89	325	568	893	962	1855	109	470	$136	20%	1005	1124	360
UT	90	707	322	1029	977	2006	113	452	$160		989	1200	320
UT	91	782	340	1122	948	2070	117	423	$174	14%	960	1234	283
UT	92	788	316	1104	918	2022	115	394	$177		930	1367	270
UT	93	871	319	1190	905	2095	118	380	$179		938	1476	270
UT	94	939	312	1251	912	2163	116	362	$180	8%	924	1590	241
UT	95	1064	344	1408	843	2251	116	353	$195		843	1693	241
UT	96	1241	276	1517	854	2371	119	311	$230	5%	866	2128	241











VERMONT

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
VT	77	262	143	405	517	922	191	438	$34	46%	352	0	
VT	82	322	120	442	356	798	155	314	$97	16%	385	0	
VT	87	285	96	381	196	577	105	196	$168	6%	250	196	
VT	88	381	0	381	186	567	102	186	$191		238	248	125
VT	89	465	0	465	182	647	114	182	$213	3%	236	280	100
VT	90	485	0	485	177	662	117	177	$243		231	323	100
VT	91	504	0	504	160	664	117	160	$266	2%	214	405	91
VT	92	589	0	589	98	687	118	98	$324		146	485	86
VT	93	701	0	701	31	732	125	31	$607		79	598	84
VT	94	770	0	770	0	770	134	0	NA	0%	42	722	81
VT	95	791	0	791	0	791	137	0	NA		41	913	74
VT	96	852	0	852	0	852	146	0	NA	0%	15	1107	66











VIRGINIA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
VA	77	123	153	276	4441	4717	92	4196	$35	32%	3558	0	
VA	82	161	281	442	3778	4220	77	3597	$69	20%	3616	0	
VA	87	210	144	354	3078	3432	58	2970	$120	12%	3169	0	
VA	88	270	252	522	3056	3578	59	2774	$133		3018	0	2300
VA	89	223	386	609	2765	3374	55	2673	$144	9%	2834	0	1448
VA	90*	223	386	609	2761	3370	54	2669	$149		2830	0	1504
VA	91*	223	394	617	2667	3284	52	2575	$182	6%	2682	326	1933
VA	92*	223	386	609	2507	3116	48	2487	$168		2743	537	1933
VA	93*	223	386	609	2598	3207	49	2413	$171		2669	537	1933
VA	94	223	386	609	2598	3207	49	2298	$187	5%	2466	715	1933
VA	95	223	386	609	2598	3207	48	2298	$196		2356	1126	1933
VA	96	471	713	1184	2189	3373	50	2189	$215	5%	2357	1453	0







256





257

WASHINGTON

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
WA	77	102	347	449	3979	4428	121	2469	$41	41%	440	0	
WA	82	194	473	667	3067	3734	88	1910	$89	32%	2464	0	
WA	87	1881	845	2726	2823	5549	123	1810	$157	18%	2553	886	
WA	88	2470	792	3262	2660	5922	127	1801	$159		2539	946	573
WA	89	2642	834	3476	2536	6012	126	1794	$168	13%	2405	1084	564
WA	90	2986	660	3646	2312	5958	120	1697	$195		2219	1250	547
WA	91	3549	402	3951	2046	5997	120	1575	$269	10%	1951	1736	500
WA	92	3760	440	4200	1896	6096	124	1498	$297		1695	1918	491
WA	93	3960	475	4435	1815	6250	126	1464	$306		1650	1711	497
WA	94	4266	423	4689	1636	6325	120	1346	$303	5%	1302	3068	516
WA	95	4413	385	4798	1586	6384	116	1307	$312		1284	3361	507
WA	96	4442	400	4842	1504	6346	113	1281	$310	3%	1187	4666	492











WEST VIRGINIA

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
WV	77	24	32	56	950	1006	54	916	$28	40%	0	0	
WV	82	29	24	53	978	1031	53	894	$52	33%	176	0	
WV	87	352	216	568	523	1091	57	480	$106	10%	404	124	
WV	88	396	144	540	550	1090	58	456	$119		417	124	383
WV	89	390	292	682	408	1090	59	324	$145	9%	762	224	136
WV	90	387	346	733	435	1168	65	352	$170		596	316	130
WV	91	446	409	855	373	1228	68	136	$230	3%	680	413	211
WV	92	453	468	921	286	1207	67	125	$230		699	513	211
WV	93	459	424	883	259	1142	64	109	$364		640	637	211
WV	94	495	424	919	251	1170	65	109	$364		640	803	211
WV	95	531	424	955	244	1199	66	85	$376		598	1121	173
WV	96	1122	666	1788	174	1962	107	75	$368	0%	588	1337	30











260

261

WISCONSIN

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
WI	77	194	960	1154	4494	5648	121	2390	$61	54%	3696	0	
WI	82	324	1282	1606	4079	5685	119	2167	$96	32%	3548	0	
WI	87	2404	1786	4190	3528	7718	161	1868	$126	18%	3568	190	
WI	88	3018	1658	4676	3378	8054	166	1796	$156		3378	598	2200
WI	89	3632	1576	5208	4583	9791	201	1721	$159	15%	4609	913	817
WI	90	3942	1526	5468	4668	10136	205	1323	$162		4739	1302	775
WI	91	4655	1510	6165	4059	10224	206	1621	$185	12%	4126	1643	995
WI	92	5262	1164	6426	4040	10466	213	1544	$205		4110	1812	893
WI	93	5639	1141	6780	3823	10603	216	1468	$221		3887	2017	847
WI	94	6567	996	7563	3685	11248	223	1384	$242	8%	3749	2315	798
WI	95	7200	870	8070	3504	11574	224	1299	$260		3519	3382	703
WI	96	7872	830	8702	3367	12069	232	1197	$270	8%	3382	5063	672











WYOMING

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living In Nursing Homes
WY	77	28	70	98	584	682	168	533	$28	19%	0	0	
WY	82	17	93	110	519	629	125	441	$75	28%	0	0	
WY	87	68	200	268	429	697	138	409	$93	19%	0	0	
WY	88	107	203	310	419	729	152	419	$96		0	0	65
WY	89	110	202	312	411	723	152	411	$112	15%	0	0	60
WY	90	126	254	380	323	703	153	323	$138		67	0	50
WY	91	222	180	402	290	692	150	290	$155		60	125	49
WY	92	313	132	445	244	689	151	244	$233	8%	90	318	48
WY	93	416	111	527	188	715	159	188	$259		90	459	47
WY	94	543	64	607	156	763	162	156	$304	3%	156	565	46
WY	95	562	60	622	147	769	158	147	$330		147	719	46
WY	96	599	75	674	145	819	166	145	$320	0%	145	864	33











UNITED STATES

State	Year	Persons with MR/DD by Home Size 1-6	7-15	1-15	16+	Total	Utilization Rate per 100,000 of State Population	State Institution Residents	Daily Costs of State Institutions	0-21 Yr. Olds as % of State Institution Residents	Persons with MR/DD Living in ICFs-MR	Persons with MR/DD Receiving HCBS	Persons with MR/DD Living in Nursing Homes
US	77	20400	20024	40424	207356	247780	115	154638	$44	36%	106166	0	
US	82	33188	30515	63703	180146	243849	105	122570	$90	22%	140682	1381	
US	87	69933	48637	118570	137103	255673	105	95022	$149	13%	144350	22689	
US	88	78173	51899	130072	137610	267682	109	91[illegible]3	$157		146134	28689	34290
US	89	88289	51137	139426	132619	272045	110	87071	$184	11%	139092	35077	37143
US	90	98551	50443	14443	128194	277188	111	83041	$197		144288	40038	41635
US	91	108479	53475	161954	125340	287294	114	78307	$206	9%	146657	51327	39208
US	92	120109	54343	174452	119463	293915	116	74775	$211		146260	62429	38799
US	93	126535	54990	181525	110330	291855	114	70760	$223		148729	86604	39501
US	94	145064	57188	202252	107191	309443	121	66235	$231	6%	142118	121575	37955
US	95	162094	51287	213381	99339	312720	119	62499	$235		134855	149342	33943
US	96	172540	56389	228929	95343	324567	122	58320	$252	5%	129449	190230	37591











REFERENCES AND DATA SOURCES

Boggs, E., Lakin, K.C., & Clauser, S. (1985). Medicaid coverage of residential service. In K.C. Lakin, B.K. Hill, & R.H. Bruininks (Eds.), *An analysis of Medicaid's Intermediate Care Facility for the Mentally Retarded (ICF-MR) Program* (Report No. 20). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

Braddock, D., Hemp, R., Bachelder, L., & Fujiura, G. (1995). *The state of the states in developmental disabilities.* Washington, D.C.: American Association on Mental Retardation.

Davis, R., Silverstein, B., Uehara, E., & Sadden, L. (1987). *Evaluation and service identification for developmentally disabled residents of intermediate care and skilled nursing facilities.* Chicago: Taylor Institute.

Gettings, R.M., & Mitchell, D. (1980). *Trends in capital expenditures for mental retardation facilities: A state-by-state survey.* Washington, DC: National Association of State Mental Retardation Program Directors.

Hauber, F.A., Bruininks, R.H., Hill, B.K., Lakin, K.C., & White, C.C. (1984). *National census of residential facilities: Fiscal Year 1982.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Hill, B.K., & Lakin, K.C. (1984). Classification of residential facilities for mentally retarded people. *Mental Retardation, 24,* 107-115.

Internal Revenue Service. (1992, Summer). *Statistics of Income Bulletin.*

Krantz, G.C., Bruininks, R.H., Clumpner, J.L. (1979). *Mentally retarded people in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1978.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Krantz, G.C., Bruininks, R.H., Clumpner, J.L. (1980). *Mentally retarded people in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1979.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Krantz, G.C., Bruininks, R.H., Clumpner, J.L. (1981). *Mentally retarded people in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1980.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Lakin, K.C. (1979). *Demographic studies of residential facilities for mentally retarded people.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Lakin, K.C., Blake, E.M., Prouty, R.W., Mangan, T., & Bruininks, R.H. (1993). *Residential Services for Persons with Developmental Disabilities: Status and Trends Through 1991.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Center on Residential Services and Community Living, Institute on Community Integration (UAP).

Lakin, K.C., Bruininks, R.H., Doth, D., Hill, B.K., & Hauber, F.A. (1982). *Sourcebook on long-term care for developmentally disabled people* (Report No. 17). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., & Anderson, D.J. (1991). Persons with mental retardation in nursing homes in 1977 and 1985. *Mental Retardation, 29*(1), 25-33.

Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., & Bruininks, R.H. (Eds.) (1985). *An analysis of Medicaid's Intermediate Care Facility for the Mentally Retarded (ICF-MR) Program*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., Chen, T.H., & Stephens, S.A. (1989). *Persons with mental retardation and related conditions in mental retardation facilities: Selected findings from the National Medical Expenditure Survey*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., Hauber, F.A., Bruininks, R.H., & Heal, L.W. (1983). New admissions and readmissions to a national sample of residential facilities. *American Journal on Mental Deficiency, 88*, 13-20.

Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., Street, H., & Bruininks, R.H. (1986). *Persons with mental retardation in state-operated residential facilities: Years ending June 30, 1984 and June 30, 1985*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Lakin, K.C., Jaskulski, T.M., Hill, B.K., Bruininks, R.H., Menke, J.M., White, C.C., & Wright, E.A. (1989). *Medicaid services for persons with mental retardation and related conditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Lakin, K.C., White, C.C., Hill, B.K., Bruininks, R.H., & Wright, E.A. (1990). Longitudinal change and interstate variability in residential services for persons with mental retardation. *Mental Retardation, 28*(6), 343-351.

Larson, S.A. & Lakin, K.C. (1995). *Status and changes in Medicaid's Intermediate Care Facility for the Mentally Retarded (ICF-MR) program: Results from Analysis of the Online Survey Certification and Reporting System*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Mangan, T., Blake, E.M., Prouty, R.W., & Lakin, K.C. (1993). *Residential Services for Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Conditions: Status and Trends Through 1992*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Research and Training Center on Residential Services and Community Living, Institute on Community Integration (UAP).

Mangan, T., Blake, E.M., Prouty, R.W., & Lakin, K.C. (1994). *Residential Services for Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Conditions: Status and Trends Through 1993*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Research and Training Center on Residential Services and Community Living, Institute on Community Integration (UAP).

National Institute of Mental Health. (1951). *Patients in mental institutions, 1950*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1956). *Patients in mental institutions, 1955*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1957). *Patients in mental institutions, 1956*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1961). *Patients in mental institutions, 1960*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1966). *Patients in mental institutions, 1965*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1967). *Patients in mental institutions, 1966.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health. (1969). *Patients in mental institutions, 1967.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Mental Health (1975). *Changes in the age, sex, and diagnostic composition of the resident population of state and county mental hospitals, United States, 1964-1973.* DHEW Pub. No. (ADM)75-158. Rockville, MD: Author.

National Institute of Mental Health (1979). *Patients in state and county mental hospitals, 1977.* Rockville, MD: Author. (microfiche)

Office of Mental Retardation Coordination, Social and Rehabilitation Service. (1969). *Residents in public institutions for the mentally retarded, 1968* (Current Facility Reports). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information.

Office of Mental Retardation Coordination, Social and Rehabilitation Service. (1970). *Residents in public institutions for the mentally retarded, 1969* (Current Facility Reports). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information.

Prouty, R.W., & Lakin, K.C. (1992). *A summary of states' efforts to positively affect the quality of Medicaid Home and Community-Based Services for Persons with Mental Retardation and Related Conditions.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Residential and Community Services.

Prouty, R.W., & Lakin, K.C. (Eds.) (1996). *Residential services for persons with developmental disabilities: status and trends through 1995.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Research and Training Center on Community Living, Institute on Community Integration.

Prouty, R.W., & Lakin, K.C. (Eds.) (1997). *Residential services for persons with developmental disabilities: status and trends through 1996.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Research and Training Center on Community Living, Institute on Community Integration.

Rotegard, L.L., & Bruininks, R.H. (1983). *Mentally retarded people in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1981 and 1982.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Scheerenberger, R.C. (1965). A current census (1964) of state institutions for the mentally retarded. *Mental Retardation, 3,* 3-4.

Scheerenberger, R.C. (1975). *Current trends and status of public residential services for the mentally retarded, 1974.* Madison, WI: National Association of Superintendents of Public Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded.

Scheerenberger, R.C. (1977). *Public residential services for the mentally retarded, 1976.* Madison, WI: National Association of Superintendents of Public Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded.

Sigford, B.B., Bruininks, R.H., Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., & Heal, L.W. (1982). Resident release patterns in a national sample of public residential facilities. *American Journal on Mental Deficiency, 87*(2), 130-140.

Smith, G., & Gettings, R. (1989). *Medicaid Home and Community Based Services for persons with developmental disabilities.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Mental Retardation Program Directors.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1990). *Projections of the Population of States, by Age, Sex, and Race: 1989 to 2010*, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 1053. U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC.

White, C.C., Lakin, K.C., & Bruininks, R.H. (1989). *Persons with mental retardation and related conditions in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1988*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

White, C.C., Lakin, K.C., Bruininks, R.H., & Li, X. (1991). *Persons with mental retardation and related conditions in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1989*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

White, C.C., Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., Wright, E.A., Bruininks, R.H. (1987). *Persons with mental retardation in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1986 with longitudinal trends from 1950 to 1986*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology.

White, C.C., Lakin, K.C., Hill, B.K., Wright, E.A., & Bruininks, R.H. (1988). *Persons with mental retardation in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1987 with longitudinal trends from 1950 to 1987*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

White, C.C., Prouty, R.W., Lakin, K.C., & Blake, E.M. (1992). *Persons with mental retardation and related conditions in state-operated residential facilities: Year ending June 30, 1990*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center on Residential Services and Community Living/Institute on Community Integration.

Zappolo, A., Lakin, K.C., & Hill, B.K. (1990). Persons in institutions and special residential settings. In I. Fitzgerald & S. Thompson-Hoffman (Eds.), *Disability in the United States*. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

APPENDIX A: KEY STATE CONTACTS

Alabama
Vince Campbell
Alaska
Diana Ray
Arizona
M. Trier
Norma Lewis
Arkansas
Carol Cromer
California
Maggie Dunaway
Colorado
Lynne Struxness
Connecticut
Lawrence Johnson
District of Columbia
Kay Campbell
Delaware
Hubert Daniels
Florida
Julie Griffith
Georgia
Frances Hale
Hawaii
David Kanno
Michael Tamanaha
Iowa
Linn Nibbelink
Idaho
Diane Helton
Richard Jacks
Jean Christensen
Illinois
Steve Kappel
Linda Gansky
Indiana
Dale Dole
Mike Flores
Randy Krieble
Kansas
Larry Sheraden
Kentucky
Wayne Chester, Jr.
Toy Reardon

Louisiana
Bonnie Callahan
Maine
Kathy McKinney
Maryland
Joe Pascuzzi
Massachusetts
Ron Sanfield
Michigan
Margie Briggs
Stu Hallgren
Bill Harrison
Minnesota
James Franczyk
Mississippi
Vanessa Breckenridge
Lisa Romine
Missouri
John Bright
Montana
Dick VanHaecke
Nebraska
John Bright
New Hampshire
Matthew Ertas
New Jersey
Bill Holloway
New Mexico
Albert Ericson
Gene Lujan
Susan Osborne
Nevada
Peter Steinmann
New York
Paul Adino
Barbara Baciewicz
Keith Caldwell
Kevin O'Dell
North Carolina
Buck Dawkins
North Dakota
Dina Barta
Mike Fisher
Robert Graham

Ohio
Mary Beth Wickerham
Donna Wood
Oklahoma
Paul Rowe
Oregon
Sean McMullen
Pennsylvania
Michael Toth
Rhode Island
Brenda Chamberlain
Camille Letourneau
South Carolina
Sharon Stokes
South Dakota
Ed Campbell
Tennessee
Jan Coatney
Glenda Tant
Roger Young
Texas
Jerald Kopp
Utah
George Kelner
Cindy Ruckman
Vermont
June Bascom
Virginia
Darlene Lee
Cynthia Smith
Washington
Ron Sherman
West Virginia
Judy Donaldson
Mark Hannah
Wisconsin
Dennis Harkins
Wyoming
Jon Fortune
Cliff Mikesell
K. Beitel